

KOREAN STUDIES IN NORTH AMERICA 1977 -1996:

A BIBLIOMETRIC STUDY

Kyungmi Chun, B.A., M.S.L.S.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

December 1999

APPROVED:

Donald B. Cleveland, Major Professor

Samantha K. Hastings, Major Professor

Ana D. Cleveland, Committee Member

Kathleen M. Swigger, Committee Member

Philip M. Turner, Director of the Program of Information
Science

C. Neal Tate, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse School of
Graduate Studies

Chun, Kyungmi, Korean studies in North America 1977-1996: A bibliometric study. Doctor of Philosophy (Information Science), December 1999, 190 pp., 73 tables, references, 59 titles.

This research is a descriptive bibliometric study of the literature of the field of Korean studies. Its goal is to quantitatively describe the literature and serve as a model for such research in other area studies fields.

This study analyzed 193 source articles and 7,166 citations in the articles in four representative Korean and Asian studies journals published in North America from 1977 to 1996. The journals included in this study were *Korean Studies (KS)*, the *Journal of Korean Studies (JKS)*, the *Journal of Asian Studies (JAS)*, and the *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies (HJAS)*. Subject matters and author characteristics of the source articles were examined, along with various characteristics such as the form, date, language, country of origin, subject, key authors, and key titles of the literature cited in the source articles.

Research in Korean studies falls within fourteen broad disciplines, but concentrated in a few disciplines. Americans have been the most active authors in Korean studies, followed closely by authors of Korean ethnicity. Monographic literature was used most. The mean age of publications cited was 20.87 and the median age of publications cited was 12. The Price Index of Korean studies as a whole is 21.9 percent. Sources written in English were most cited (47.1%) and references to Korean language sources amounted to only 34.9% of all sources. In general, authors preferred sources published in their own countries. Sources on history were cited most by other disciplines.

No significant core authors were identified. No significant core literature were identified either.

This study indicates that Korean studies is still evolving. Some ways of promoting research in less studied disciplines and of facilitating formal communication between Korean scholars in Korea and Koreanists in North America need to be sought in order to promote well-balanced development in the field. This study suggests that as many and as great a variety of titles in all formats as possible need to be collected to support research in Korean studies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the Center for Korean Studies at the University of Hawaii at Manoa for the partial funding of this study. In addition I would like to thank my colleagues at Hamilton Library at University of Hawaii: Susie Cheng, Sumie Ota, and Patricia Polansky, who helped me verify cataloging records for the items in Chinese, Japanese, and Russian languages.

I would also like to thank Dr. Joel Bradshaw at the University of Hawaii Press for editing my dissertation and for sharing his thoughts with me on some points described in the dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Korean Studies	
Bibliometric Study	
Scope of the Study	
Problem Statement	
Research Questions	
Purpose of the Study	
Significance of the Study	
Limitations	
Assumptions	
Definitions	
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	18
Korean Studies Literature	
Characteristics of Literature Use	
3. METHODOLOGY.....	41
Articles in <i>Korean Studies</i> , <i>Journal of Korean Studies</i> , <i>Journal of Asian Studies</i> , and <i>Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies</i>	
Citations in the Articles	
4. SOURCE ARTICLES	52
Subjects of the Source Articles	
Authors of the Source Articles	

5. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LITERATURE CITED I: CITATION FREQUENCY, FORM, AND AGE.....	70
Number of Citations	
Form of Publication	
Age of Publication	
6. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LITERATURE CITED II: LANGUAGE, PLACE, AND SUBJECT	90
Language of Publication	
Place of Publication	
Subject of Publication	
7. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LITERATURE CITED III: CORE AUTHORS AND SOURCES.....	114
Most Frequently Cited Authors	
Most Frequently Cited Sources	
8. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	129
Summary of the Study	
Implications of the Study	
Suggestions for Further Research	
APPENDIX	139
A. Tables 35-39	
B. Tables 40-44	
C. Tables 45-49	
D. Tables 50-54	
E. Tables 55-59	
F. Tables 60-66	
G. Tables 67-73	
REFERENCES.....	186

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Disciplinary Foci of the Literature of Korean Studies in Various Format.....	21
2. Average Percentage of References in Foreign Languages.....	35
3. Number of Source Articles.....	52
4. Disciplines in Korean Studies	54
5. Subspecialties in Korean Studies	56
6. Disciplines and Journals.....	58
7. The Major Contributing Authors.....	60
8. Authors and Journals.....	62
9. Country of Origin of Authors in Korean Studies	63
10. Country of Origin of Authors and Subject Distribution.....	65
11. Institutional Affiliation of Authors	66
12. Author's Institutional Affiliation and Journal	67
13. Institutions and Subject Distribution.....	69
14. Number of Citations by Year of Publication.....	71
15. Number of Citations by Journal	71
16. Number of Citations by Discipline.....	71
17. Form of Publication.....	73
18. Disciplines and Form of Publication	76
19. Age of Publication.....	81

20. Disciplines and Age of Publication.....	84
21. Age Distribution and Form of Publication.....	89
22. Language of Publication.....	91
23. Disciplines and Language of Publication.....	93
24. Original Languages of Translated Sources	95
25. Country of Origin of Authors and Language of Publication.....	97
26. Place of Publication.....	101
27. Disciplines and Place of Publication.....	103
28. Country of Origin of Authors and Place of Publication.....	105
29. Subject of Publication	109
30. Disciplines and Subject of Publication.....	111
31. Most Frequently Cited Authors.....	115
32. Most Frequently Cited Monographs	121
33. Most Frequently Cited Journals	122
34. Most Frequently Cited Newspapers	124
35. Country of Origin of Authors and Form of Publication, Economics.....	140
36. Country of Origin of Authors and Form of Publication, History.....	142
37. Country of Origin of Authors and Form of Publication, Language	144
38. Country of Origin of Authors and Form of Publication, Literature.....	145
39. Country of Origin of Authors and Form of Publication, Politics & Government.....	146
40. Country of Origin of Authors and Age of Publication, Economics.....	149
41. Country of Origin of Authors and Age of Publication, History.....	150
42. Country of Origin of Authors and Age of Publication, Language	152

43. Country of Origin of Authors and Age of Publication, Literature	153
44. Country of Origin of Authors and Age of Publication, Politics & Government.....	154
45. Country of Origin of Authors and Language of Publication, Economics	156
46. Country of Origin of Authors and Language of Publication, History.....	157
47. Country of Origin of Authors and Language of Publication, Language.....	158
48. Country of Origin of Authors and Language of Publication, Literature.....	159
49. Country of Origin of Authors and Language of Publication, Politics & Government	160
50. Country of Origin of Authors and Place of Publication, Economics	162
51. Country of Origin of Authors and Place of Publication, History.....	163
52. Country of Origin of Authors and Place of Publication, Language	164
53. Country of Origin of Authors and Place of Publication, Literature	165
54. Country of Origin of Authors and Place of Publication, Politics & Government.....	166
55. Country of Origin of Authors and Subject of Publication, Economics.....	168
56. Country of Origin of Authors and Subject of Publication, History	169
57. Country of Origin of Authors and Subject of Publication, Language.....	170
58. Country of Origin of Authors and Subject of Publication, Literature.....	171
59. Country of Origin of Authors and Subject of Publication, Politics & Government .	172
60. Most Frequently Cited Authors, Anthropology & Sociology	174
61. Most Frequently Cited Authors, Economics	175
62. Most Frequently Cited Authors, History.....	175
63. Most Frequently Cited Authors, Language	176
64. Most Frequently Cited Authors, Literature	176

65. Most Frequently Cited Authors, Philosophy & Religion.....	177
66. Most Frequently Cited Authors, Politics & Government.....	177
67. Most Frequently Cited Sources, Anthropology & Sociology	179
68. Most Frequently Cited Sources, Economics	180
69. Most Frequently Cited Sources, History	181
70. Most Frequently Cited Sources, Language	182
71. Most Frequently Cited Sources, Literature	183
72. Most Frequently Cited Sources, Philosophy & Religion	184
73. Most Frequently Cited Sources, Politics & Government.....	185

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This research is a descriptive bibliometric study of the literature of the field of Korean studies. Its goal is to quantitatively describe the literature and serve as a model for such research in other area studies fields.

Korean studies is an interdisciplinary field which draws upon the Korean aspects of disciplines in the arts, humanities, and social sciences. Bibliometrics is one of the measures in information science of scholarly communication and information dissemination through the analysis of the literature of various disciplines and subspecialties. This bibliometric study is the first attempt of its kind to describe and explore the historical picture of research interests and formal communication patterns in the Korean studies field in North America by analyzing its literature, the written records of scholarly activities. Theoretically, this study enables information scientists to expand their knowledge of scholarly communication. Practically, it provides decision criteria for appropriate grants distribution in Korean studies, promotes cooperation between scholars in Korea and Koreanists in North America, and facilitates the field's future development. It also provides practical aids for information specialists and librarians for bibliographic control and such library services as collection development and maintenance for the Korean studies field.

Korean Studies

Korea was introduced to the western world from as early as the 16th century through diaries and correspondences written by a few voyagers and missionaries. But it was not until the end of the 19th century that some level of scholarship on Korea was produced by westerners. American knowledge of Korea grew from the books written by American missionaries, diplomats, and others at the end of the 19th century. America demanded more knowledge about Korea after the end of World War II and the beginning of the American military occupation of South Korea in 1945 (Nahm, 1983). The modern study of Korea in the U.S. began with language courses at the Defense Language Institute in 1947 and 1948, and a course on Korean history at the University of California at Berkeley (MacDonald, 1990). The Korean War (1950-53) greatly increased U.S. interest in Korea. From 1965, many organizations and centers for Korean studies began to take shape, as more courses on Korea were taught at colleges and universities, a large number of papers on Korea were presented at regional and national academic and professional meetings and conferences, source materials became available, a growing number of books and doctoral dissertations were produced, and new journals of Korean studies appeared (Nahm, 1983). The first Peace Corps volunteers arrived in Korea in 1966 (O'Donnell, 1979). The interest generated by returning Peace Corps and military personnel, by the growing community of Korean immigrants to the U.S., now well over a million (MacDonald, 1990), and by Korea's fast economic development also drew attention to Korean studies in the 1970s and 1980s. There are currently over ninety universities and colleges in the U. S., that offer Korean language courses

(<http://www.kofo.or.kr/kki2.htm>). Over twenty Korean studies programs are identified in North America (http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~korea2/directory_list.html).

Korean studies in North America focuses on Korean aspects of disciplines in the arts, humanities, and social sciences. This boundary can be seen through the lists of departments and courses involved with the study. There are no separate departments for Korean studies established in colleges and universities in North America. Courses and degrees are offered either through Asian or East Asian studies programs or through general disciplinary departments. For example, the University of Hawaii offers degrees and courses with either full or partial Korea-related content in fields such as Asian studies, art, dance, economics, history, language, literature, music, political science, and sociology (Center for Korean Studies, 1997; see also <http://www2.hawaii.edu/korea/Academic%20Programs/koreacourses.htm>).

The U.S. government and educational foundations financially supported Korean studies in the 1960s. The Committee on Korean Studies of the Association for Asian Studies was established in 1966 and the Joint Committee on Korean Studies between the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council was established with the support by the Ford Foundation in 1967. However, U.S. support declined to low levels in the 1970s (Nahm, 1983). At the same time, however, the Korean government began to support Korean studies abroad during the 1970s and 1980s by establishing and supporting various foundations, for example, the Korea Traders Scholarship Foundation and the Korea Research Foundation.

Korean studies in North America is expected to grow more rapidly than ever as a consequence of recent efforts by the Korean government to promote the field overseas. For example, the Korea Foundation was established in Korea in 1992 to "promote mutual understanding, friendship, and cooperation between Korea and foreign countries through academic, personnel, and cultural exchanges" (Korea Foundation, 1995, p.2). The Foundation's primary responsibility is to support Korean studies abroad. Under its auspices, universities outside Korea, including many in North America, are "provided with funds for the establishment, expansion, and operation of Korean studies courses and professorships. In addition, universities, research institutes, and academic organizations are granted support for such activities as the publication of Korean studies-related materials and hosting academic conferences" (p. 6). This level of support is expected to produce more activities and developments in the field than ever before.

An academic field is grounded in its intellectual base. The field is developed through continuous review and refinements of the base. The discipline's self-analysis is necessary to improve teaching and research. Despite its history of over half a century, there have been only few reviews of Korean studies in North America. At this point, in the beginning stages of expected faster growth in Korean studies, it is appropriate to appraise the collective body of its past and present scholarship and research, and to plan for a better future. Such reviews can be either qualitative or quantitative. As is shown in the following "Literature Review" chapter, there have been only brief subject analyses of conference papers, books, and dissertations in Korean studies from the beginning of

1980s. This study will contribute to the understanding of the Korean studies field through a quantitative analysis of its journal literature from North America.

Bibliometric Study

There are many ways of understanding a field of study. One way is to analyze the publications produced by its community. A scholarly publication is "an expression of the state of a scholar or group of scholars at a particular time" (Price, 1970, p. 6). The literature in any subject, which constitutes a record of the knowledge and activities in the field, has been accepted as the primary method of communication. Therefore, analysis of the literature helps to understand the field of study by revealing its authorship and patterns of publication and literature use. This study undertook a quantitative analysis of the literature to identify and examine the scholarly base of Korean studies as a field.

This method of quantitative analysis of literature was initially called "statistical bibliography" (Hulme, 1923) and later "bibliometrics" (Pritchard, 1969). Pritchard defined bibliometrics as "the application of mathematics and statistical methods to books and other media of communication" (p. 349). The basic elements of bibliometric analysis of a given literature have been its subject matters, authors, citations (references given by the source documents), formats in which it is published, languages, age, and its places of publication. It has been used to delineate "the topography of current scientific literature" (Price, 1965, p. 515); "to shed light on the processes of written communication and of the nature and course of development of a discipline (in so far as this is displayed through written communication)" (Pritchard, 1969, p. 348); "to document and explain the regularity of communication phenomena" (Kent, 1987, p. 156); "to study the growth and

distribution of the scientific literature" (Lievrouw, 1990, p. 60); and "to demonstrate historical movements, to determine the national or universal research use of books and journals, and to ascertain in many local situations the general use of books and journals" (Raisig, 1962, p. 450). Borgman (1990), Saracevic and Perk (1973), and others realized that a quantitative study of the written record of scholarship in combination with other quantitative or qualitative methods can provide a rich characterization of communication processes and a broad picture of the historical development of the field.

Scope of the Study

There have been no bibliometric studies performed for Korean studies. This study is the first study of its kind to understand Korean studies in North America through the analysis of subjects and authors of articles and through the analysis of the citations given by articles in Korean studies and Asian studies journals from 1977 to 1996. The journals included in this study are *Korean Studies (KS)*, *Journal of Korean Studies (JKS)*, *Journal of Asian Studies (JAS)*, and *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies (HJAS)*. *KS* and *JKS* are the only two journals entirely devoted to Korean studies. This study groups the data for five-year periods: 1977-1981, 1982-1986, 1987-1991, and 1992-1996 in order to compare the patterns of communication and to trace trends in the growth and development of Korean studies over a period of time.

Analysis of Subjects and Authors of Articles

Korean studies is an interdisciplinary field. The analysis of the subject matters of the articles in Korean studies from 1977 to 1996 should: (1) identify various disciplinary components within Korean studies; (2) reveal subject distribution patterns and shifts in

subject coverage over those years; and (3) identify gaps in the range of issues addressed by the Korean studies community in North America. The political, social, and cultural changes over two decades in both the Korean peninsula and North America, and in the relationship between the peoples and regions might have occasioned some change in the scholarly interests of Koreanists. This study will provide a historical understanding of the orientation, problem areas, and intellectual foci of Korean studies in North America.

The analysis of article authorship will identify the major contributors to Korean studies in general, the major contributors in each discipline, and their countries of origin and institutional backgrounds. Are these major contributors Korean? Are they Americans? Which North American institutions have hosted the most, or the most important, Koreanists? Are more productive authors in a particular discipline of Korean studies associated with particular institutions? These are important questions for the field's future development, for appropriate distribution of grants, and for cooperation between scholars in Korea and Koreanists in North America.

Citation Analysis

Citation analysis of the literature is an unobtrusive research method concerning the use of information and sources of information. Analysis of references to earlier literature in publications within a field delineates a profile of the literature of the field. This literature profile reveals the means and patterns of communication and information needs and uses in the field. This study profiles the Korean studies literature by analyzing the following elements: citation frequency, authors, and such characteristics of cited documents as subject, form, age, place, and language of publication.

Citation frequency is the number of references cited in a source document. The number of references in scholarly works generally increases as a disciplinary field matures (Parker et al., 1967). Analysis of cited authors and cited documents reveals key contributing authors and publications among the authors and the literature of the past in the field. The form of publication reveals the types of media in which authors in a field choose to communicate their research results. The age of the references is also an important indicator of the structure of a literature. The age of cited publications reveals the extent to which authors in a given field reach back into the literature of the past to find information related to their current research topics. Counting and categorizing the cited publications by country of origin and by language reveals the extent to which authors use resources published in countries and languages other than their own. These characteristics show the degree of internationalization of the field. It reveals the effect of a foreign language on the use of source materials so that it can be reflected in collection development. Subject categorization of cited documents can address questions as to how much use researchers in one field make of subjects beyond their own field. As various aspects change within and between Korea and America, citation patterns of scholars should change accordingly.

Various categories of authors are identified in the Korean studies community who publish articles in journals in North America: (1) Korean authors publishing internationally, (2) Korean authors holding positions outside Korea, and (3) non-Korean authors. In addition to the different literature profiles developed by various disciplines, there is also the possibility that these various author groups use different sources. This

variability may reflect different viewpoints, for example, national and international views, different sources available to each group at different timespans, and different preferences, for example, as to language or country of origin, with regard to the sources they use. The different literature profiles used by these various author groups can reveal the possible effects of their different backgrounds or their limitations on their communication patterns and information-seeking behaviors. They would also reveal the extent to which Korean scholars and Koreanists outside Korea communicate with each other or, in different words, the extent to which one group's scholarship contributes to the other.

Problem Statement

Knowledge of the structure of the literature in a field enables us to understand the field of study by revealing its patterns of communication and information use. This understanding enables us to develop appropriate information systems for the field. Of the research methods in information science, bibliometrics has proved to be a valuable tool for the understanding of the structure of the literature of a field. However, there have to date been no bibliometric studies of area studies fields, including Korean studies, despite the importance of knowing about other cultures in this increasingly global economy. This study will add much to the limited amount of knowledge that we have about communications in Korean studies and perhaps function as a model for other area studies fields.

Research Questions

This study sought to answer the questions listed below. As this research analyzed source articles and their citations, two different groups of questions were derived for

these two different groups of data. To delineate the historical changes in Korean studies, some of the questions were studied for five-year periods: 1977-81, 1982-86, 1987-91, and 1992-96. Where disciplinary difference is concerned, the questions were also studied by disciplines.

Questions for Source Articles

1. Which disciplines and research topics form the core of Korean studies?
2. What are the characteristics of authors who produce articles in Korean studies?
 - Which authors contributed the most?
 - What is the nationality of the authors? Is Korean studies in North America led by Koreans or by non-Koreans?
 - What are the institutional affiliations of the authors? Which institutions contribute most?
 - Do these author characteristics differ in different disciplines?

Questions for Literature Cited

1. What are the citation frequencies per article?
2. What are the characteristics of the literature cited in articles in Korean studies?
 - What is the distribution of publication formats in the literature in Korean studies? That is, what percentages are cited of books, collections, journal articles, newspapers, music scores, maps, public documents, manuscripts, and personal interviews?

- What are the ages of references at time of citation?
 - What are the languages of the sources? What foreign-language effects might be discernible?
 - In what country were the sources published?
 - What are the subject areas mostly represented by the literature?
 - How do the characteristics of the literature used by various author groups differ: (1) for Korean authors publishing internationally, (2) for Korean authors holding positions outside Korea, and (3) for non-Korean authors?
3. Who are the most highly cited authors?
 4. What are the most highly cited sources?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this bibliometric analysis is (1) to build knowledge about the development of Korean studies as a research field and (2) to determine the scholarly communication patterns within Korean studies. Bibliometric analysis designed to identify the structure and communication patterns in an interdisciplinary field like Korean studies is obviously a very broad undertaking. However, this study aims to take the first step and lay the foundation for further work by investigating the history and structure of the field and the scholarly communication of Koreanists as revealed in the articles and their citations of North American journals in Korean studies and Asian studies for 1977-1996.

Significance of the Study

The results of this study will add to the body of knowledge within information science, help assess and promote research within Korean studies, and supply information providers such as librarians with a better understanding of the needs of the Korean studies community as they exercise bibliographic control and plan for collection development and maintenance. This study can also serve as a model for other bibliometric studies in other area studies.

Expanding the Knowledge Base within Information Science

The citation behavior and information use of scholars doing research on countries other than their own and of foreign scholars publishing internationally have been less studied than those of scholars in other general fields. This study will contribute to the knowledge base of information science by exploring this relatively understudied population.

Assessing the Field of Korean Studies

Korean studies as a field of inquiry in North America has a history of at least half a century. Any field of study in the process of growth assesses its path as a part of disciplinary self-awareness that marks any maturing field (Borgman, 1990). This self-awareness can direct the field's future development. Assessing and understanding the research and scholarly literature of Korean studies can reveal which topics or disciplines are overemphasized or underemphasized. It can suggest where to redress imbalances in subject coverage and where to nurture the field's interdisciplinary relationships. Such outcomes of this study will enable scholars to plan new research agendas. This study will

thus help assess the field of Korean studies and provide a starting point for further qualitative assessments of the field.

Promoting Research in Korean Studies

Ongoing research is based on previously built knowledge. The progress of research in a discipline is advanced by a clear view of the discipline's structure (Frohmann, 1982). This study will inform the increasing number of doctoral students and researchers about issues and problems in the field. It helps prospective graduate students better identify programs in line with their areas of interest. It may also guide prospective authors about appropriate publication projects by suggesting answers to questions like the following: (1) What are the most visible (highly cited) journals in the field?; (2) What source materials are most cited?; and (3) In which languages or countries are they published? It could also help granting agencies better allocate financial resources, as this study reveals specialties of different Korean studies programs and productive institutions, and of authors as a whole and authors in different specialties.

Identification of Information Needs and Uses within Korean Studies

As Raisig (1962) claims, bibliometrics can serve as a method of analyzing information needs. Bibliometric studies have revealed that the use of any collection of bibliographic items is not generally distributed evenly. Some items may be used fairly heavily, others may receive moderate use, and some may hardly be used at all. These observations can provide an objective basis on which to make decisions in various information systems. The needs and uses of information in the Korean studies community that was identified by this study—in terms of the form, titles, subjects, ages, languages,

and places of publication of references cited—would certainly aid in bibliographic control services, collection development, and maintenance of Korea collections in North America.

Aids to Bibliographic Control

There are only few secondary bibliographic services such as indexes, abstracts, retrospective bibliographies, and current awareness services available for Korean studies. Even the most comprehensive such service, the *Bibliography of Asian Studies*, has been lagging far behind. Its volume for the year 1991 did not appear until June 1998, and its recently developed online version indexes only a few journals up to 1998. This is a much needed area of development if Korean studies is to be efficiently promoted in North America and elsewhere. This study will identify resources and even individual titles to be included, both for each disciplinary base and for the field as a whole, in such secondary services in order to provide appropriate, cost-effective coverage. The few subject bibliographies and indexes that exist in Korean studies have never been objectively appreciated. The results of this study will provide a base for such an evaluation. Similarly, the list of publications ranked according to their importance, and the identification of its core literature will also help to evaluate Korea collections.

Aids to Library Services including Collection Development and Maintenance

According to statistics provided in the February 1997 issue of the *Journal of East Asian Libraries*, less than half of about 30 Korea collections in North America have librarians with Korean language and subject expertise. Korea collection developers

without Korean language or subject expertise will be much aided by the data produced by this study.

Even Korea collection developers with such expertise often face situations where they can only spend a certain amount of funds for their collection, as do their colleagues in any field. Moreover, library funding continues to decline even in the face of rapid expansion of vast and costly new resources. In addition to limited funding for acquisition, libraries often have to make decisions about remote storage and weeding out obsolete materials. This citation analysis will rank-order journals and books by citation frequency and thus aid material selection, journal subscriptions and cancellations, and retention and location of collections, whether or not Korea subject specialists are available to make those decisions.

There are also needs to prioritize collections for cataloging and retrospective conversion of cataloging records into machine-readable form. Due to the shortage of Korean language and subject experts, there are many cataloging backlogs in Korea collections in North American institutions. One frequent proposal to reduce the backlog at the University of Hawaii Library's Korea collection is to catalog certain materials at a minimum level, with no subject headings assigned. Retrospective conversion of card catalogs to machine-readable form for Korean language records has lagged behind that of western language materials, due largely to the expense of converting files containing Korean language script. Library automation projects have often left unconverted significant numbers of Korean language records or have converted only minimum catalog information into machine readable form. It is very difficult to retrieve Korean language

materials catalogued at such minimum levels. This because (1) most publicly accessible library terminals used in the western world do not display or allow searches in vernacular scripts and (2) catalog records of materials in Korean are displayed and searched in romanized form and the romanization system currently used in the library world is difficult for the general public to use.

Solutions to these problems need to be formulated that strive to maximize the benefits and services to users within the bounds of existing manpower and funding resources. By analyzing the literature, this study will provide objective information on which to base such decisions, in combination with other factors, especially local conditions and usage patterns.

Model for Other Area Studies Fields

There are many other area studies beside Korean studies, which have been established in North America. Some examples of these are East Asian (Chinese and Japanese) studies, South Asian studies, Southeast Asian studies, Latin American studies, among others. However, despite their long history, there have been no bibliometric studies of these area studies fields. This study can function as a model for such research in other area studies fields.

Limitations

One of the recurrent criticisms of bibliometric studies is their failure to cover various types of source materials, especially monographs as well as journal articles. Even though the criticism itself has not been widely tested, many have noted that monographic literature plays an important role in the primary communication process in the humanities

and the social sciences (Line, 1979; MacRoberts and MacRoberts, 1989; Lindholm-Romantschuk and Warner, 1996).

Nevertheless, the sources of data for this study was limited to research articles and their references in four Asian studies journals, including the two Korean studies journals. Therefore, even though this study is expected to be a stepping stone for further research in scholarly communication within Korean studies, it may not be possible to generalize the results to the entire body of literature in Korean studies. Similar studies on different types of source materials and on a wider array of journals should be done in the future so as to facilitate comparison and synthesis.

Assumptions

It is assumed that journals are a primary communication medium in a field. It is further assumed that articles published in and literature cited in Asian studies journals, including two scholarly journals devoted exclusively to Korean studies, *Korean Studies* and the *Journal of Korean Studies*, are truly representative of the literature of Korean studies in North America.

Definitions

'Area studies' is defined as studies on countries or regions other than the authors' own. Area studies in North America include East Asian studies (China, Japan, and Korea); Southeast Asian studies; Latin American studies; European studies; among others.

'Source articles' is defined as articles published in the four Korean studies or Asian studies journals, which provides data to be analyzed in this study.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The first part of this literature review is on Korean studies in North America. Some statistics on Korean studies literature were produced, but there has been no citation analysis of the literature. The attempt has been made to excerpt the contents related to its literature from the general assessments of Korean studies in North America. The second part reviews previous research on bibliographic characteristics of the literature. Since very few bibliometric studies have been done on area studies, the characteristics reviewed here are of general disciplines and their subspecialties. The findings of the scholarly literature on specific areas, regions, or cultural groups are addressed when available.

Korean Studies Literature

Very few preliminary quantitative or qualitative analyses of the literature of Korean studies have been done, and most were done more than 15 years ago. Most of the analyses are found in a conference proceeding (Morse, 1983).

The previous analyses can be compared to some of the findings of this study to identify the changes in or the continuity of research trends in Korean studies. However, it should be noted that direct comparison of the previous assessments with the findings of the current study needs careful attention since each analyzes different types of data: the previous studies primarily analyzed dissertations or monographs, while this study analyzes journal articles.

Size of the Literature

Shulman (1970, 1982, 1983) and Nahm (1983) analyzed the status of dissertation research on various Korean subjects in the United States, based on data sources in Shulman's compilations of doctoral dissertations on Korea. According to Shulman (1983), 1,139 doctoral dissertations dealing in whole or in part with Korea were produced in higher education institutions in the United States from the early 1900s to 1979. Nearly two-thirds (813 out of 1,139) were completed during the 1969–79 period. Nahm (1983) counted only those that dealt exclusively with Korea and found that 681 dissertations were completed between 1921 and 1981. Of these, 635 were completed since 1955: 102 in 1955–64; 253 in 1965–74; and 280 in 1975–81.

Nahm (1983) analyzed English-language books on Korea published only by commercial presses, university presses, centers for Korean studies, and other research institutions in the United States to October 1982. Among 248 books, 10 were published before 1911; 24 in 1911–45; 45 each in 1946–55 and 1956–65; 96 in 1966–79; and 28 in 1980–1982. Nahm (1983) also analyzed scholarly papers on Korea presented at annual meetings of the Association for Asian Studies and at its regional conferences. He found that 240 papers were presented between 1945 and 1982: 12 papers in 1945–64; 24 in 1965–69; 176 in 1970–80; and 28 in 1980–82. These various studies all show that the size of the various forms of literature on Korea has increased dramatically since the 1970s.

Disciplinary Focus

Both Shulman (1983) and Nahm (1983) concur in finding that dissertations up to the beginning of the 1980s were concentrated in political science/international relations, economics, education, history, sociology, and language/linguistics. Based on sources provided by Nahm (1983), Table 1 compares the first 10 disciplinary foci in various formats of literature on Korea. The analyses by Nahm were not based on the same disciplinary categorization for different types of publications. For example, the 240 papers presented at the meetings were categorized into 26 fields; the 248 books into 30 categories; and the 681 dissertations into 36 fields. Therefore, it may not be a completely accurate comparison of disciplinary foci in different types of literature. However, the comparison is attempted to see any noticeable differences.

Politics/international relations is at the top of each list. All three formats show high concentrations in economics and history in addition to politics/international relations. Some differences in ranks are easily noticed. Dissertations were more concentrated in the social sciences (as opposed to the humanities), especially economics, education, and sociology, than were papers and books. It is worth noting that the classification system for dissertations did not include "Korean War" as a separate field, while the system for papers and books considered the war to be separate. If the latter category were lumped into "history," the percentage of papers and books on "history" would increase to 17.92 and 14.52, respectively, even though relative rankings would not change. Conversely, if dissertations on the Korean War were separated out, even fewer would fall into the category of "history." Also noteworthy are the high percentages of

Table 1. Disciplinary Foci of the Literature of Korean Studies in Various Format

Rank	Papers presented (1945–82) [Total = 240]	English-language books (–1982) [Total = 248]	Dissertations (1921–81) [Total = 681]
1	Politics/International Relations [51 (21.25%)]	Politics/International Relations [4 (19.35%)]	Political science [121]/ International Relations [34] (22.76%)
2	History (internal/foreign relations) [31 (12.92%)]	History [24 (9.68%)]	Economics [134 (19.68%)]
3	Language/Linguistics [27 (11.25%)]	General [22 (8.87%)]	Education [74 (10.87%)]
4	Economics [18 (7.5%)]	Economics [17 (6.85%)]	History [60 (8.81%)]
5	Korean women [13 (5.42%)]	Korean war [12 (4.84%)]	Sociology [52 (7.64%)]
6	Korean war [12 (5.0%)]; Koreans abroad/Immigrants [12 (5.0%)]	Literature [10 (4.03%)]	Language/Linguistics [43 (6.31%)]
7		Anthropology/Sociology [8 (3.23%)]	Overseas Koreans [25 (3.67%)]
8	Anthropology [9 (3.75%)]; Sociology [9 (3.75%)]; Philosophy/Religion [9 (3.75%)]	U.S.-Korean relations [7 (2.82%)]	Anthropology [21 (3.08%)]
9		Philosophy/Religion [6 (2.82%)]	Philosophy (2)/Religion (18) (2.94%)
10		Language/Linguistics [5 (2.02%)]; Overseas Koreans [5 (2.02%)] Culture/Society [5 (2.02%)] Geography [5 (2.02%)]	Military/National Security [10 (1.47%)]

Note. Only the top 10 fields, out of 26-36, for each format are listed.

papers presented on "language and linguistics" and on "Korean women" and the relatively high percentage of books on "literature" in contrast to the very low percentage of dissertations on "literature." Finally, it should be noted that the number of dissertations in sociology increased dramatically after 1975, from 12 in 1921–74 to 40 in 1975–81 (Nahm, 1983).

Shulman (1983) noted that relatively little attention had been paid on the doctoral level to the humanities, with the exception of contemporary history. He proposed that this concentration in social sciences and contemporary history might be partly accounted for by the fact that most of the authors of dissertations were Korean nationals, who pursue domestic degrees in their national history, literature, and civilization but tend to go abroad to study the social sciences. Many Korean graduate students in the social sciences applied their disciplinary training to Korean subjects. However, they did not remain as Korean specialists in the United States. Shulman questioned whether most of these students could be defined as area specialists in Korean studies rather than simply specialists within specific academic disciplines who happen to be of Korean origin. Kim (1983) makes a similar observation. Even though there were numerous doctoral dissertations on and studies of the Korean economy, most authors did not maintain their interest in Korean area studies. Kim also notes that there were about a hundred scholars in sociology and anthropology, but only a score or so were active in Korean studies. The current study can add to and clarify our understanding of the disciplinary foci of Korean studies by analyzing journal articles that are written by Korea specialists squarely within the realm of area studies.

Authorship

Most of the dissertations were written by Korean nationals pursuing their doctorates at American institutions and by individuals of Korean descent. According to Nahm (1983), 522 (76.7%) out of the 681 dissertations focusing on Korea between 1921 and 1981 were completed by authors with Korean surnames and 147 (21.6%) by Americans and 12 by others. However, caution should be exercised in generalizing about authorship in Korean studies solely on the basis of dissertation research. As discussed under "Disciplinary Focus" below, not all of the authors of dissertations on Korea can be counted as Koreanists in North America. This is because the majority of the dissertations on Korea are done by students who pursue their degrees in the United States but do not pursue scholarly careers in the U.S.

While dissertations were completed mostly by Koreans throughout the period analyzed, some changes occurred in book authorship. According to Nahm (1983), up to 1965, some 87 books were authored by Americans while 22 were authored by Koreans. However, the trend reversed from 1966 to 1982, with 44 books by non-Koreans and 65 by Koreans. By 1982, a total of 131 books on Korea had been authored by non-Koreans and 87 by Koreans. It will be interesting to observe the country-of-origin ratios of the authors of the journal articles on which the current study is based.

Institutional Affiliations

According to Shulman's (1983) analysis, between 1969 and 1979, institutions with Korean studies programs awarded large numbers of degrees for research on Korea: the University of Hawaii (59 dissertations), Harvard University (40), Columbia University

(19), and the University of Washington (18). At the same time, many other institutions without Korean studies programs also awarded notable numbers of degrees. Most of these institutions offered very few or no courses on Korea. For example, such universities as Indiana, Minnesota, Berkeley, Southern California, Florida State, Pennsylvania, Michigan State, Illinois, Pittsburgh, Wisconsin at Madison, American, University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), Maryland, Michigan, Claremont, George Washington, Oregon, Stanford, and Temple each produced 26 to 11 doctoral dissertations on Korea. Several of these universities later established Korean studies programs during the 1980s and 1990s, including Berkeley (in 1981), Southern California, and UCLA. It bears repeating here that not all institutions that produced doctoral dissertations on Korea necessarily participated in Korean studies. The current study will show if the researchers in these institutions are among the major authors of journal articles in Korean studies.

Language of materials used by non-Koreans

Shulman (1983) noted that most of the Americans who undertook doctoral research relating to Korea, mostly on U.S.–Korean relations, did not have Korean language training, in contrast to those doing research relating to China and Japan. He noted that the number of Americans gaining language proficiency in Korean was small, and only a few of them completed advanced-degree programs. This would suggest that the Americans relied only on western-language sources, mostly in English, for their research on Korea or on U.S.–Korean relations. By analyzing the languages of materials used by Korean and non-Korean researchers in Korean studies, this study will identify the language preferences of the two author groups.

Characteristics of Literature Use

Citations are a primary tool for measuring information use. Analysis of various citation elements reveals patterns of information use by scholars in a field. In this review it is shown that there are considerable differences across disciplines and countries with regard to citation patterns and other bibliometric features. These differences are products of different disciplinary or national or international publication and communication behavior.

It will be interesting to see if some of the variations found in this literature review turn up in the current study, which involves several disciplines and different author groups researching the same subject area. At the same time, comparison of the literature reviewed here with the findings of the current study will be able to help clarify whether area studies research exhibits bibliographic similarities with or differences from other general fields of study.

Citation Frequency

In their study of 17 communication journals over a 16-year period, Parker et al. (1967) inferred that "a small number of citations indicates an emerging field, because the number of citations is increasing with time across the set of journals, all of which represent fields in early or intermediate stages of evolution as disciplines" (p. 62). Hence, as a field develops a larger body of literature, an increasing number of references are cited. Price (1970) noticed a slow but steady increase in references in all fields. He referenced Parker et al.'s finding that, for the social sciences, references per article jumped from 8.4 in 1950 and 9.4 in 1955 to 15.2 in 1960 and 15.5 in 1965.

Studies noted that different disciplines, different specialties, and different countries have different rates of citation. For example, Narin (1976) found distinct differences across fields. While engineering & technology and mathematics have low citation counts (5–6) per publication and psychology and biology show 8–10, the field of biomedical research shows citation counts in the range of 18–20. Murugesan and Moravcsik (1978) studied articles in a various specialties of theoretical physics in a variety of journals from different countries. Their study shows (1) that the number of citations per article is much lower for Soviet journals than for European, US, or Japanese journals, and (2) that this number is much lower for solid-state physics than for high-energy or nuclear physics. They speculated that the lower number of citations in Soviet journals could possibly be explained by a relatively weak communication system within the scientific community in that country. In a citation analysis of articles from psychology, psychiatry, and sociology journals from 5 different countries, Lange (1985) found that certain disciplines in different countries often have different citation rates. For example, sociological journals in socialist countries cited significantly fewer publications than those of capitalist countries, while psychological and psychiatric journals did not show any variation.

Lancaster, Lee, and Diluvio (1990) found that Korean mathematicians cited an average of 7.5 sources per paper in articles published nationally, but an average of 12.5 per paper in articles published abroad. Similarly, Philippine scientists cited an average of 12.75 sources per paper in national publications, but an average of 17.9 per paper in international publications. If the number of references is any measure of scholarship, then

these findings show that papers published abroad are more scholarly than those published in domestic journals.

Accessibility

Studies often find that accessibility of materials is a major determinant of their use. Soper (1976) investigated the effect of physical accessibility upon the use, and hence the citation, of works. She found that, in general, the largest proportion of works cited was located in personal collections, a smaller proportion was located in libraries in departments and institutions to which respondents belonged, and the smallest proportion was located in libraries in other cities and countries. However, respondents in the humanities differed significantly from those in the natural and social sciences. They cited almost as many works located in the main institutional library as in their personal collections, and a substantial proportion of their citations were to works found in libraries far removed from their home institutions.

Determinants of literature use include not only physical accessibility but also bibliographical accessibility. If material is not covered by indexing and abstracting services, authors are less likely to become aware of it. In his analysis of the use of citations as a research technique, Friis (1955) concluded that citations were closely related to the degree of physical and bibliographical accessibility of materials.

These research findings confirm that authors tend to cite materials that are more accessible to them, rather than necessarily the best ones. A document's language, place of origin, and age can also affect its degree of accessibility. The effects of these citation elements are reviewed below.

Forms of Publication Cited

Citation studies show greater reliance on certain publication formats in certain disciplines. It is well known that the humanities use far more books than any other formats and that the social sciences use slightly more books than journal articles, while the natural sciences rely mostly on journal articles. In his survey of citation studies, Broadus (1971) showed that books received about 60–70% of all citations in humanities disciplines like music, philology, and fine arts, 30–60% in various social science disciplines, and below 10% in some natural science disciplines.

In his study of English literary journals, Heinzkill (1980) also depicted the humanities as dominated by books and lacking central journals. By analyzing SSCI data, Miwa et al. (cited in Miyamoto et al., 1990) found that publications in political science cited more books than journal articles, whereas articles in psychology cited more journal articles than books. In the interdisciplinary field of women's studies, 43.6 percent of references were to journal articles, while only 35 percent were to monographs (Futas, 1980).

The Design of Information Systems in the Social Sciences (DISISS) project revealed that there were very large differences in the forms of materials cited by serials and monographs (Line, 1981). In all subjects, serials made nearly twice as many references to serials as did monographs (47% to 25%). On the other hand, serials made 39% of citations to monographs, while monographs made 51% to monographs. Line warned that citation analyses should use both types of source materials to avoid the bias

that might be caused by using only one type. The DISISS study also revealed large differences between subjects in forms cited.

Interestingly, Parker et al. (1967) concluded that "citation of minor sources is highly journal-specific, and certain journals have unique patterns of source-citation" (p. 18). In a study of 17 communication journals, they found that journals accounted for 43 percent of citations, books for 31 percent, and newspapers and magazines for 8 percent. However, newspapers and magazines received over 25 percent of the total citations in the *Journal of Broadcasting* and 24–45 percent in the *Journalism Quarterly*.

Bolles (1975) analyzed the references of articles in the first 21 volumes (1949–69) of *American Quarterly*, a journal he assumed represented American studies. He found that 50.07 percent of references were to monographs and 42.6 percent were to periodicals, including newspapers. Together, these two forms comprised 92.67 percent of citations. However, his longitudinal analysis showed that while citations of monographs decreased (from 64.20% in 1949–50 to 42.74% in 1969), newspaper citations increased (from 1.27% to 18.27%), as did citations of unpublished materials (from 1.27% to 10.62%). Peters (1990) found that American historians writing on the history of modern Germany cited monographs as 33.96 percent of their sources, serials as 14.26 percent, newspapers as 9.91 percent, government documents as 7.22 percent, and manuscripts as 33.94 percent. This high percentage of manuscript use resulted from his counting each item in a collection, whether printed or archival, as a separate item. Metoyer-Duran's (1993) analysis of American Indian studies found that books were used most (48.8%), followed

by journals (21.3%) and government documents (8.7%). These three forms accounted for 78.8 percent of all forms used.

Age of Literature Used

Aging studies commonly measure either the median age of citations (Line & Sandison, 1974), the number of years required to encompass the most recent 50% of all references made, or Price's index, which measures the percentage of references to works published in the most recent five-year period, or simply categorizes ages by five- or ten-year intervals. Whichever method is used, studies reveal that different disciplines, source characteristics, and author nationalities show different citation aging patterns.

Price (1970) measured the growth of knowledge for a number of fields in a sample of 154 journals by computing Price's Index. He found that the median index over all fields of science and nonscience was 32 percent, with quartiles at 21 percent and 42 percent of sources published within the most recent five-year period. He observed that journals in the hard sciences often showed indices above 43 percent, while those in the humanities often hovered around 10 percent. Price offers an interesting interpretation of this phenomenon:

It would seem that this index provides a good diagnostic for the extent to which a subject is attempting, so to speak, to grow from the skin rather than from the body. With a low index one has a humanistic type of metabolism in which the scholar has to digest all that has gone before, let it mature gently in the cellar of his wisdom, and then distill forth new words of wisdom about the same sorts of questions. In hard science the positiveness of the knowledge and its short term permanence enable one to move through the packed down past while still a student and then to emerge at the research front where interaction with one's peers is as important as the storehouse of conventional wisdom. The thinner the skin of science the more orderly and crystalline the growth and the more rapid the process. (p. 15)

A project on the Design of Information Systems in the Social Sciences (DISISS) that analyzed monographs and serials separately revealed that source characteristics might be reflected in aging patterns (Line 1981). According to its findings, (1) citations in serials showed a much faster decay than citations in monographs in nearly all subjects and for all forms of material cited; (2) highly cited serials aged the literature more quickly than did a randomly selected sample of serials; and (3) differences in date distributions among the different forms of material cited were very large.

Christovao (1985) found differences in aging patterns between articles whose first authors had different nationalities. His study of literature in biomedical sciences revealed that articles from "developed" countries aged the literature much faster than articles from "developing" countries. Lawani (1977a) also speculated about the influence of national traditions of scholarship in reporting his results that French agronomists cited literature that was 15 years older than what their American counterparts did.

In an analysis of the relatively new, interdisciplinary field of women's studies, Futas (1980) found that Price's Index was 33 percent and the median age was about 8 years. Bolles's (1975) analysis of the field of American studies found that 17.74 percent of references were to items less than 10 years old, while 56.10 percent of the citations were to materials published within 55 years. Materials between 31 and 55 years old (20.47%) and between 81 and 130 years old (19.52%) received the most citations from authors in American studies. Peters's (1990) study of sources used by American historians writing on the history of modern Germany found that 18.1 percent of references were to items less than 10 years old, while 53.6 percent were to literature published within 30

years. Metoyer-Duran (1993) found that 46.4 percent of the citations made by authors in the relatively young field of American Indian studies were to literature less than 20 years old. Items 10–20 years old received the largest percentage of citations, at 27.8% percent.

Language of Literature Cited

Garfield and Welljams-Dorof (1990) analyzed citations of 900,000 source items indexed in the 1984 Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) database (SCI, SSCI, and AHCI) over a five-year period, 1984–88, to see language use in international research. Although the ISI databases cover only a sample of the international scientific journals, the authors were confident that the covered journals represented the major international research publications. The results show that, regardless of the native languages of the authors, more source items are published in English than in any other language. These have the highest impact and most of the nations with major scientific establishments cite the English-language literature almost exclusively. Garfield and Welljams-Dorof also found that in most non-English-language works, especially Japanese and Russian, the majority of the producers and consumers are native speakers. However, they conclude that the world becomes aware of non-English research through a nation's English-language publications. Hence, there is good intranational citation of the world literature.

However, this study uses source items from ISI databases biased to English publications, despite the authors' claim that the source items represent major international research. It has been revealed that authors of English-language publications are heavier users of their own language materials. For example, Broadus (1977) noted that "citation studies seem to indicate that for most fields, writers in English-language publications tend

to draw on sources in the same language" (p.326). Reguant and Casadella's study of geology publications (1994) confirms that the citing of non-English literature by most English-speaking authors is scarce or nonexistent. Yitzhaki (1988) summarizes the findings of previous studies of English-language publications. English-speaking authors in science and technology make very little use of foreign-language material (mainly French and German), amounting to approximately 8–15 percent of the material they cite. In the social sciences, the use of foreign-language material ranges from none to 12 percent, showing even less usage than in science and technology. On the other hand, studies of various fields in the humanities show citation rates of foreign-language materials varying from 0.8% up to 67%.

Studies reveal that not only authors of English publications, but also authors of other languages, tend to prefer literature in their own languages. For example, Kanasy's (1971) analysis of the literature of microbiology and Louttit's (1957) study of psychologists, chemists, and physicists writing in English, French, and German have determined that most disciplines show heavy reliance on literature in the native language of the authors. Some possible explanations for this high rate of language self-citation have been explored (see Yitzhaki, 1988; Smith, 1981; Line, 1981; Lawani, 1977a). Among the reasons proposed are (1) the relative lack of research literature in foreign languages; (2) lack of awareness of the foreign language materials due in large part to poor coverage of such materials by secondary services; (3) lack of knowledge of or fluency in foreign languages; (4) the unavailability or inaccessibility of the foreign language material; (5) the tendency to give local readers references in their own mother-

tongues in order to make things easier for them; and (6) the perceived unimportance of foreign literature.

Citation analyses have revealed that the percentages of references to foreign-language works within a particular field in a particular country is not always the same as the percentage within the same field in another country. In his examination of the professional literature used by Americans and French agronomists, Lawani (1977b) found that 45% of the publications used by French authors were in languages other than French, while only 2% of the literature used by Americans were in foreign languages. Tamura et al. found in a study using *Chemical Abstracts* that Russian chemists cite Russian publications more frequently than those in English, whereas Japanese chemists cite Japanese publications less often than those written in English (cited in Miyamoto et al., 1990).

Table 2 is created from figures provided in Yitzhaki's examination of language barriers in different fields in different countries. As the table shows, Louttit (1957) found that psychology authors in English-language journals cited foreign-language materials in 7.5 percent of their references, while the comparable figures were 8.9 percent in German journals, 35.4 percent in French journals, and 75 percent in Italian and Spanish journals. In the field of fine arts, Simonton's (1960) analysis of citations in *Art Bulletin* showed 55.1–67.3% references to foreign-language materials in English journals, 56% in French journals, 24% in German journals, 47.5% in Italian journals, and 30% in Spanish journals. In biblical studies, Yitzhaki (1988) found that about one third of the references

Table 2. Average Percentage of References in Foreign Languages

Fields	Language of Source Articles				
	English	French	German	Italian	Spanish
Psychology (Louttit 1957)	7.5	35.4	8.9	75	75
Biblical Studies (Yitzhaki 1988)	31.7 (2.1)	63.8 (3.0)	18.4 (3.9)	67.9 (3.6)	84.2 (1.7)
Fine Arts (Simonton 1960)	55.1– 67.3	56	24	47.5	30

Note. Figures in parentheses are 'Linguistic Isolation' coefficients.

in English-language journals were to foreign language materials, compared to two-thirds in French journals, 20–30% in German, 60–70% in Italian, and 85% in Spanish journals.

Caution should be exercised in interpreting the percentages in Table 2. Even though it is true that authors in certain fields in certain countries use more foreign-language materials than others, the percentages alone do not tell the degree of use. In other words, it is not true that authors in English-language journals in biblical studies are heavier users of publications in their own language than French or Italian writers are. A high rate of language self-citation revealed in a citation analysis may simply reflect the relative lack of research literature in foreign languages (Yitzhaki, 1988). To make this point clear, Yitzhaki calculated a 'linguistic isolation' coefficient by dividing the language self-citation rate by the estimated proportion of that language in the total output of the field. The 'language isolation' coefficient is shown in parenthesis for biblical studies. These figures suggest that Germans are the heaviest users of publications in their own language, followed by Italian, French, English, and Spanish authors. The 'language

isolation' coefficient is not available for other fields. Since it is difficult to estimate the total output of a field, 'language isolation' coefficients are rarely provided in bibliometric studies.

As these comparisons show, the results of citation studies are not conclusive on the question of the language of references. At best, it seems that the degree of preference with regard to the language of cited publications depends on discipline, the location of the subject studied, country of publication, or the native language of the author, as Broadus (1971) and Lange (1985) concluded. Furthermore, these general observations above pertain to disciplines apart from area studies, where foreign-language sources play a much more vital role in scholarly research. Cullars (1988) found that English-speaking authors cited as much as 63 percent foreign-language materials in their studies of foreign literature. Peters's (1990) analysis of American historians writing on the history of modern Germany showed that German-language sources provided 62.17 percent of the references while English-language sources provided only 34.52 percent. The only other language of any significance was French, which accounted for only 2.79 percent of the sources.

Place of Publication

Place of publication, along with language, measures the internationality of research in a field. As in the case of language use, there is generally a strong tendency for scholars in most countries to refer to and be cited by their own publications, especially in the cases of the U.S. and the U.K. Cronin's analysis (1981) of literature in educational psychology and Herman's study (1991) of English-language journal literature in

librarianship and information science found that authors in the U.S. and the U.K. cited a majority of their own national literature. Even though the citations to domestic materials are still high, Line (1979) showed that monographs in the U.S. and the U.K. are three times more likely than journals to refer to nondomestic publications.

On the other hand, Lange (1985) found that Anglo-American predominance and own-country biases are not universal, but vary from country to country and from discipline to discipline. Line (1981) noted that "most social sciences are inevitably more concerned with local conditions and circumstances than pure and applied science, which is much less affected by national boundaries" (p. 83). Historical, political, social, and geographical factors that interact with the situation in the respective field appear to affect the orientation of scientists toward considering the publications of other authors.

Arunachalan and Markanday (1981) found that a large percentage of the articles cited by Australian and Canadian authors were published in the U.S. and the U.K. They speculated that the proximity of Canada to the U.S. and the close political ties of Australia and Canada with both the U.S. and the U.K. facilitate their scientific communication.

In their studies of Philippine scientists and Korean mathematicians, Lancaster, Lee, and Diluvio (1990) found that authors' citation practices differed when publishing in a national journal and when publishing internationally. Korean sources were exactly four times more likely to be cited by Korean mathematicians in national publications than in international ones. Japanese sources accounted for 13% of the citations in the Korean journals but only 2% of those in the international journals. Similarly, Philippine sources

were exactly twice as likely to be cited by Philippine scientists publishing in national journals than when publishing outside the Philippines. The study concluded

A certain percentage of all citation may occur primarily for purposes of "window dressing" (e.g., an author may go out of his way to cite sources published in the country to which he submits a paper or even to cite the journal to which the submission is made) and this aspect of citation behavior is one that has received little attention in the literature. (p. 243)

In fields specifically focused on foreign study, both foreign-language materials and foreign-country publications show the highest usage rate. Peters (1990) found that the majority (57.37%) of references by American historians writing on German history were to sources published in Germany. U.S. publications followed second, at 26.35%, and U.K. publications third, 9.97%.

Subjects of the Citations

It is generally argued that authors working within a long tradition of scholarship to which they themselves have made contributions or within a well-defined field show high rates of self-citation (So, 1995; Chung, 1995). On the other hand, high rates of self-citation could mean that authors are very self-indulgent in citing their own previous work or work in their own field (So, 1995).

Krishna (1964) suggested that the interdisciplinary approaches of the social sciences would be reflected in their citation practices. However, the DISISS project (Line, 1981) revealed that the subject distribution of serial references made and citations received differed greatly across disciplines. While criminology, geography, social policy, sociology, political science, and education made relatively few references (29–33%) to works in their own fields, economics and psychology made very high percentages (70–

80%) of references to their own fields, and those works were themselves very largely cited by other publications in their own fields (77–89%).

In his survey of British and American citation studies of the social sciences, Broadus (1971) hypothesized that "writers of books limit themselves to a less restricted subject area than those writing articles in professional periodicals" (p. 239). He observed that in sociology citations drawn from books showed only a 16.8 percent rate of subject self-citation, while citations drawn from journal articles showed self-citation rates of 32.9–42.8 percent. Similar results were observed for economics.

Lau's (1995) citation analysis of Chinese communication research in English-language journals—both Chinese/Asian studies journals and journalism/communication journals—revealed that almost every article used sources from Chinese history more than sources from journalism and communication.

In studies of ethnic groups, the subject distribution of citing documents does not always match that of the cited documents. In his analysis of American studies publications from 1949–69, Bolles (1975) found that only 40 percent of the citations were to literature and history, while 59.96 percent of the citations were drawn from articles related to those areas. Over 27 percent were to such unclassified materials as newspapers, unpublished materials, and nonprint media. Over the period studied, the use of materials on literature and history decreased. On the other hand, general journals and reference sources remained relatively important to researchers in American studies throughout the period studied, and the use of unpublished and unclassifiable materials increased.

Metoyer-Duran's (1993) analysis of American Indian studies found that anthropology

(27%), ethnohistory (20.6%), and literature (9.8%) were the most studied subjects, while anthropology (33.5%), U.S. history (10.9%), and literature (9.3%) were the most cited subjects. Anthropology was cited by many articles in other fields, and U.S. history received far more citations from other fields when compared to the percentage (2.8 %) of articles on the subject.

Journal Self-citations and Cross-citations

Lau's (1995) study of Chinese communication research found that there were few self-citations of authors and journals. *China Quarterly* and *Journalism Quarterly*, the two most important journals in their respective fields, had the highest self-citation rates among the 9 journals studied. Lau also found very little cross-journal activities between Chinese and communication journals; authors tended to use journals in their own field. In other words, there is little interchange between communication and Chinese studies authors.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

One crucial matter in carrying out a bibliometric study is the selection of the publications from which to draw data to be analyzed. It is important to find sources as representative of the field as possible. Ideally, the source data should include all research publications in a field to give a representative picture of the field. The findings of any less inclusive study will have limited generalizability and validity. However, it is difficult to identify all research publications in a field, especially for a field like Korean studies, which lacks comprehensive indexes, abstracts, bibliographies, or machine-readable databases. It is impossible to avoid focusing on some subset of all the research publications in the field. Therefore, the ability of the researcher to clearly identify the representative subset of Korean studies literature is important to offset some of the problems inherent in bibliometric study.

The scholarly journal is the major formal channel in which research and other scholarly activities are recorded and communicated. Peer-reviewed articles in academic journals are certainly the most validated body of knowledge acceptable in the field. Also, journal articles are an ideal venue for longitudinal studies of the history and development of a field. This study limits its source data to scholarly journal articles and, further, to those published in Korean studies journals and Asian studies journals in North America. It is recognized that there are articles on Korea published in other more general

disciplinary journals as well. However, the sources for this study are limited to articles from journals devoted to Korean studies and Asian studies specifically.

The journals so chosen are *Korean Studies (KS)*, *Journal of Korean Studies (JKS)*, *Journal of Asian Studies (JAS)*, and *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies (HJAS)*. Among these journals, *KS* and *JKS* are the only North American journals devoted entirely to academic research on Korea. This study makes the basic assumption that the articles published in these chosen journals accurately represent scholarship in the field of Korean studies. It is also assumed, as in all other citation studies, that cited documents relate to the content of the citing document. Cited documents imply use of those documents by the citing author to identify problems and issues in a field.

Korean Studies began publication in 1977 as a product of the University of Hawaii's Center for Korean Studies and the University of Hawaii Press. From 1977 to 1996, *KS* published 122 research articles, 3 review articles, and 3 research notes in 20 volumes, averaging 6.4 articles per volume, with a minimum of 3 (vol. 8) and a maximum of 12 (vol. 19). In addition to the articles, it published 1 conference report, 1 translation of a historic document, and 164 book reviews (averaging 8.2 per volume). 128 articles, averaging 31.90 citations per article, yielded 4,083 citations. As stated on the inside cover of the journal, it attempts to publish articles dealing with Korea in all academic disciplines. The journal sometimes carries conference papers. In other cases the editors have solicited papers on a particular theme. For example, volume 5 served as a special issue on Korean literature; volume 6 is a Festschrift for a language teacher; volume 10 published 3 conference papers on "the roots of modern Korean nationalism,

1876–1920"; volume 13 (1989) focused on the March First Movement (1919); volumes 15 and 16 published papers from a conference on "the future of the Korean Peninsula in the 1990s"; volumes 17, 18, and 19 carried many papers from a major international conference on Korean studies held in Honolulu in 1992; and volume 20 contains a collection of articles on the relationship between Korea and Japan. In volume 16, the journal's editors announced the intention of including articles in translation "to introduce its readers to the most recent theory and research in Korean academic circles." However, only two such translations of articles published in Korean have so far appeared, one on literature (vol. 16) and another on political economy (vol. 20). Translations of conference papers delivered in Korean have appeared more frequently.

The *Journal of Korean Studies* was launched in 1979 by the Society for Korean Studies. Its editorial offices were first located at the University of Washington in Seattle. In 1989 they moved to the East Asian Studies Center at the University of Southern California, and in 1994 to the Center for Korean Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles. *JKS*, which has been issued irregularly, published 43 research articles and 4 review articles in 8 volumes between 1979 and 1992, averaging 5.9 articles per volume, with a low of 5 and a high of 7. It reviewed 36 books (averaging 4.5 per volume). 47 articles, averaging 46.72 per article, yielded 2,196 citations. Although the journal has not ceased publication, its 9th volume had still not been appeared as of August 1999. In its inaugural volume, the editors say the journal's purpose is "to maintain a catholicity of view" by avoiding disciplinary specialization. They also announced the intention to carry papers presented at scholarly conferences so that readers can "benefit from the extended

discussion of certain unified issues in the Korean field." The first volume carried papers from a symposium on "political participation in Korea."

The *Journal of Asian Studies* (*Far Eastern Quarterly* until September 1956) was founded in 1941 and is published quarterly by the Association for Asian Studies (formerly the Far Eastern Association). The journal has published 10 research articles and 1 review article on Korea over the 20-year period 1977–96. Eleven articles, averaging 40.91 citations per article, yielded 450 citations.

The *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* was founded by the Harvard-Yenching Institute in 1936 and has been issued twice a year since volume 37 (1977). It published only 7 articles on Korea between 1977 and 1996. Seven articles, averaging 62.43 citations per article, yielded 437 citations.

Data was collected from a 20-year timespan to allow for the identification of trends or changes over time. Because journals chosen for this study either appeared no more than once a year (less in the case of *JKS*) or contained only a few articles on Korea over the 20-year period, it was decided to include all articles and their references. Editorials, a conference report, translations of historic documents, and book reviews were excluded from the study. A total of 193 articles (182 research articles, 8 review articles, and 3 research notes) and all citations received by the articles constitute the data for this study.

The cited references were drawn from the footnotes, endnotes, reference lists, or bibliographies of source articles. Implicit citations were not included for analysis. However, in cases where the authors integrated part of the bibliographic information of

the cited documents in the text and the rest in the footnotes and endnotes, full bibliographic information was recovered by checking the referring texts. Repeated references to the same item in each article were considered a single citation. In other words, references such as *ibid.* and *op. cit.* were not counted. Manuscripts in a collection, whether printed or archival, were counted as one item.

The characteristics examined in this study fall into two different datasets. One set pertains to the articles themselves, and includes the subject matters of the articles and the country of origin and institutional affiliation of the authors. The other set pertains to the citations in those articles, which include the number of citations in each article; the subject, format, age, country of origin, and language of cited sources; and most frequently cited authors, individual works, and journals.

Korean Studies and the *Journal of Korean studies* are not indexed in citation indexes published by the ISI. The *Social Sciences Citation Index* indexes the *Journal of Asian Studies* and the *Arts and Humanities Citation Index* indexes the *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*. However, the data in the citation indexes are not usable for this citation study because of their often inaccurate treatment of Asian names. The indexes do not correctly identify Asian names of personal and corporate authors. For example, the cited surnames and given names for Asian authors are often listed in inverted form, and institutions are often treated as personal names. Worse yet, this treatment is not consistent throughout the indexes. Therefore, data had to be manually collected directly from the articles in the four journals.

A computer file for source articles was created on a spreadsheet program (Microsoft Excel) by downloading the bibliographical information using subject headings assigned from the *Bibliography of Asian Studies (BAS)* online. Another computer file for all citations was created first on a word processor (Microsoft Word) by scanning footnotes, endnotes, reference lists, and bibliographies of each article. Very intensive editing of the scanned text was necessary because of the scanner's limited ability to recognize the italics most commonly used for titles in citations and also such special characters as quotation marks, colons, and diacritic marks used for romanization of foreign languages. Extracting bibliographic information from textual footnotes and endnotes also required lots of editing work. The file was then converted to a Microsoft Excel file, placing the same bibliographic element from each citation on the same column.

Articles in *KS*, *JKS*, *JAS*, and *HJAS*

The following information was coded for each article:

1. source article number
2. author's name(s)
3. country of origin of the authors
4. institutional affiliation of the authors
5. number of authors
6. name of the journal
7. date of publication
8. number of unique references
9. subject disciplines and subcategories

A unique source number was assigned to each article. This article number was derived in part from the number given to the citations so that it can be used to identify where each item was cited.

A master list of all authors was created. Names were edited for the sake of consistency. Each author's institutional affiliation was gleaned from the article bylines and list of contributors. Since some authors change affiliation between successive publications, such traits were counted as of the time each article appeared. Since it is not possible to identify the current naturalized countries of all authors, the country of origin of authors is identified on the basis of the author's name and his/her institutional affiliation. An 'adjusted count' was used to measure productivity scores for each author or institution: 1 point was awarded for a single-authored work; 0.5 point each for two coauthors; and 0.33 point each for three authors.

Since the *Bibliography of Asian Studies (BAS)* published by the Association for Asian Studies indexes the journals chosen for this study, its subject assignments were adopted for this study. The online version of the *BAS* was used to identify the subjects of the articles. On those few occasions where the bibliography assigned inappropriate subjects, the researcher's subject expertise as a Korea specialist librarian was exercised to correct the errors.

Citations in the Articles

It is not uncommon to find errors and mistakes in citations, especially in citations of foreign language materials. To make matters worse, authors sometimes translate the foreign titles into English without noting that they were originally published in languages other than English. Authors sometimes name the translators as authors without supplying either the original author's name or any indication that the work is a translation. Also, authors sometimes do not provide all the bibliographic components of citations. To have

as many correct and complete citations as possible, all citations were verified on the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN) bibliographic utility and the online catalogs of the University of Hawaii Library, the University of California Libraries, Columbia University Library, the Library of Congress, and other library catalogs as needed. For verifiable works, missing information was supplied and incorrect bibliographic information was corrected.

The following information was coded for each reference given by the source articles. If any of the information needed for coding was not available or not applicable for cited documents, a 'na' code was assigned. Since the citations were gathered from various citation formats, for example, footnotes, endnotes, bibliographies, and references, which are not created in a uniform way, lots of decisions needed to be made by the researcher for the sake of data consistency. The decisions are described below.

1. citation identification number
2. unique title identification number
3. name of the cited authors
4. format
5. date
6. language
7. country of publication
8. subject classification

A master list of all citations was created. An identification number was assigned to each citation. In addition to the citation identification number, a unique title identification number was also assigned to identify the most highly cited serials or monographs. That is, if a citation to the same journal, newspaper, or monograph occurs again in other articles, the same title identification number was used.

The publication format categorizes the cited references as monographs and serials. Monographs include books, collections, pamphlets, and unpublished items such as conference presentations, theses, dissertations, and manuscripts. Serials include journals, annuals or yearbooks, almanacs, society transactions, proceedings of conferences, and newspapers. Government publications are also categorized into monographs and serials. A book chapter or an article in a collection of chapters and articles written by different authors was considered as an article in a monograph.

There are manuscripts published many years later as reprints, for example, a work done in the 17th century is reprinted in the 20th century. Also, it is often not possible to identify whether or not an item was published at the time of creation. Therefore, all items, no matter when they were published, were counted as published items, not as manuscripts.

There are lots of primary sources published in different editions and/or translations by different translators and publishers. When a publication is a reprint or new edition of a previous manuscript or publication, both the date of the original and the date of the reprint or new edition were analyzed in two different categories. Authors often did not provide the date of the edition of a primary source that they used for their study. In this case, the publication date was identified as unknown (or 'not available') since several editions are often available. The original date of creation or publication was identified from cataloging records and the *Han'guk Toso Haeje* (Bibliographical notes on Korean literature) published by the Koryo Taehakkyo Minjok Munhwa Yon'guso (Korea Cultural Research Center, Koryo University, Seoul, Korea) in 1971, which provides annotated

bibliographical information of the pre-1910 Korean literature. There are many Asian materials created before the 20th century whose creation dates are unknown. Also, many of these materials are collections of an author's work. In such cases, the author's year of death, if known, was taken as the original creation date. In the case of multivolume works with multiple publication dates with no indication of the publication date of the volume being cited, the latest year of publication was taken. When entire multivolume works were cited, the latest publication year was also taken. There are also items for which the original creation dates cannot be decided since they are collections of several items created over a long period of time, such as an anthology of modern Korean literature. In such cases the original creation date was identified as 'not applicable'.

The identification of the language of the cited titles is sometimes difficult since authors often provide translated bibliographic information without any indication of the original source language. Unless otherwise identified in the process of verification, the language of the bibliographic information provided by the authors determined the language of the cited items.

When a document was published by a multinational publisher, the country of publication was determined by what the author provided. If the author provided several places of publication, the first place was considered. If an item was created by a colonial or occupying government, the author's country of origin was considered to be that of the governing country. However, the country under occupation or colonial rule was counted as the country of the publication. For unpublished archival materials, the country where the archives are currently kept was coded as the country of the publication.

The assignment of subject classification to each cited document was based on the Library of Congress (LC) classification system. The same search to verify the correct bibliographic information also identified the classification numbers. In the case of monographs, the book's classification number was used to determine its discipline. In the case of journal articles or items in collections or serials, the classification number of the journal/collection/serial was used to represent the cited item's discipline. For uncatalogued materials, such as unpublished conference papers and uncatalogued theses, the researcher's expertise as a Korean specialist librarian was used along with other librarians' expertise, to assign a LC classification number.

Names of the cited authors were edited for consistency, especially the foreign names. The authors cited were ranked to identify key contributing authors to the field of Korean studies in general and to each discipline. As in the analysis of the source articles, an adjusted count was used to measure citation scores for authors. The monographic titles and the serial titles cited were also ranked to identify those that contributed the most to the field of Korean studies in general and to each discipline.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows was used to analyze the data. Frequency tables, descriptive statistics, cross-tabulations between nominal (categorical) variables were performed. Microsoft Excel was also used for some data analysis.

CHAPTER 4

SOURCE ARTICLES

Analysis of the subject matter and authorship of articles in Asian studies and Korean studies journals over a 20-year period can reveal research trends and show which authors and institutions contributed most to the field of Korean studies. This chapter presents the results of such analyses over a span of four five-year periods.

The number of articles published in the four periods is shown in Table 3. The number dropped about 20% during the second period (1982-1986), but gradually rose back up to the initial by the fourth period. It is too early to determine if this change in the number of articles published in the four journals indicates changing interests in the field during this period. It should be tested in future studies, but the inauguration of two journals devoted solely to Korean studies in 1977 and in 1979, respectively, seems to indicate a high level of interest in Korean studies before and during the first period (1977-1981).

Table 3. Number of Source Articles

	1977-81	1982-86	1987-91	1992-96	Total
Number of	53	42	46	52	193
Articles	27.5%	21.8%	23.8%	26.9%	100.0%

Subjects of the Source Articles

The subject classification used by the *Bibliography of Asian Studies (BAS)* is found in its online database, <<http://bas.umdl.umich.edu/b/bas/help/classification.html>>. Its classification encompasses both disciplines and subspecialties. The *BAS* disciplinary classification follows.

- Anthropology & Sociology
- Arts
- Communication & Media
- Economics
- Education
- Geography
- History
- Language
- Library & Information Sciences
- Literature
- Philosophy & Religion
- Politics & Government
- Psychology & Psychiatry
- Science & Technology

Disciplines in Korean Studies

The disciplinary distribution of the articles published in the four journals is presented in Table 4. As calibrated from the four representative scholarly journals in Korean and Asian studies, research in Korean studies falls within fourteen disciplines. It should be noted that articles on historical and sociological aspects of science were classified under science & technology.

Research in Korean studies has been concentrated in a few disciplines. Among the fourteen disciplines of Korean studies, only three (history, literature, politics & government) comprise over 50% of all articles published in the four journals. Half of the fourteen disciplines comprise over 90%.

Table 4. Disciplines in Korean Studies

	1977-81	1982-86	1987-91	1992-96	Total	Cumulative %
History	19 35.8%	22 52.4%	12 26.1%	12 23.1%	65 33.7%	33.7%
Literature	8 15.1%	1 2.4%	4 8.7%	10 19.2%	23 11.9%	45.6%
Pol. & Gov.	7 13.2%	1 2.4%	5 10.9%	10 19.2%	23 11.9%	57.5%
Anth. & Soc.	6 11.3%	3 7.1%	6 13.0%	6 11.5%	21 10.9%	68.4%
Language	5 9.4%	6 14.3%	3 6.5%	4 7.7%	18 9.3%	77.7%
Economics	3 5.7%	1 2.4%	9 19.6%	4 7.7%	17 8.8%	86.5%
Phil. & Rel.	3 5.7%	4 9.5%	2 4.3%	4 7.7%	13 6.7%	93.3%
Arts	2 3.8%	1 2.4%		1 1.9%	4 2.1%	95.3%
Comm. & Media		2 4.8%		1 1.9%	3 1.6%	96.9%
Sci. & Tech.		1 2.4%	1 2.2%		2 1.0%	97.9%
Biography			1 2.2%		1 0.5%	98.4%
Education			1 2.2%		1 0.5%	99.0%
Gen. & Misc.			1 2.2%		1 0.5%	99.5%
Geography			1 2.2%		1 0.5%	100.0%
Total	53 100.0%	42 100.0%	46 100.0%	52 100.0%	193 100.0%	

History was the most studied discipline over the past 20 years, followed by literature and by politics & government and in order by anthropology & sociology, language, and economics. However, the number of articles in history dropped sharply (by 50%) after its peak period during 1982-1986, even though history still held sway as the most studied discipline in Korean studies into the fourth period, 1992-1996. Interestingly, research on literature and on politics & government shows the same pattern, namely, a big start, then a slowdown, then rapid acceleration.

Research on economics showed rapid acceleration from 2.4% to 19.6% over the second and third periods, then dropped back to 7.7% during the final period. Like history, research on language seems to be decreasing after reaching a peak in 1982-1986. It is difficult to perceive trends in anthropology & sociology and in philosophy & religion, since they have fluctuated greatly over the 20-year period.

Subspecialties in Korean Studies

The 193 articles are further classified into 48 subspecialties within 14 disciplines. Table 5 shows the top 15 subspecialties in Korean studies over the past 20 years. As is the case with disciplines, subspecialties within Korean studies show a skewed distribution in favor of a subset. Fifteen among 48 topics account for 72% of all articles published in the journals.

The most studied specialty was the history of the Yi Dynasty (1392-1910), followed by history from antiquity to 1392. However, research on these two top subjects, like historical research in general, has declined ever since the second period (1982-1986). The degree of decline was more severe in pre-1392 history (from 11.9% in the second

Table 5. Subspecialties in Korean Studies

	1977-81	1982-86	1987-91	1992-96	Total	Cumulative %
Hist. – Yi Dynasty (1392-1910)	4 7.5%	11 26.2%	5 10.9%	6 11.5%	26 13.5%	13.5%
Hist. – Antiquity to 1392	4 7.5%	5 11.9%	2 4.3%	1 1.9%	12 6.2%	19.7%
Language – Linguistics	4 7.5%	2 4.8%	2 4.3%	4 7.7%	12 6.2%	25.9%
Pol. & Gov. (general)	3 5.7%	1 2.4%	1 2.2%	6 11.5%	11 5.7%	31.6%
Literature – Fiction	4 7.5%	1 2.4%	1 2.2%	4 7.7%	10 5.2%	36.8%
Hist. – Chosen (1910-1945)	1 1.9%	3 7.1%	3 6.5%	2 3.8%	9 4.7%	41.5%
Hist. – Historiography	7 13.2%		1 2.2%		8 4.1%	45.6%
Anth. & Soc. – Immigrant Community	2 3.8%	1 2.4%	2 4.3%	3 5.8%	8 4.1%	49.7%
Literature – Poetry	2 3.8%		3 6.5%	2 3.8%	7 3.6%	53.4%
Pol. & Gov. – Int. Relations	2 3.8%		3 6.5%	2 3.8%	7 3.6%	57.0%
Language (general)	1 1.9%	4 9.5%	1 2.2%		6 3.1%	60.1%
Econ. – Economic History		1 2.4%	5 10.9%		6 3.1%	63.2%
Literature (general)	2 3.8%			4 7.7%	6 3.1%	66.3%
Phil. & Rel. – Confucianism	2 3.8%	2 4.8%	1 2.2%	1 1.9%	6 3.1%	69.4%
Phil. & Rel. – Buddhism		2 4.8%	1 2.2%	2 3.8%	5 2.6%	72.0%

period to 1.9% by the fourth period) than in history of the Yi Dynasty (from 26.2% to 11.5%). Most of the articles on Yi Dynasty history (1392-1910) concentrate on the period from the late 19th century to early 20th century, the period in which Korea opened its doors to foreigners and accordingly experienced many changes. Sixteen of the 26 articles on the five-century history of the Yi Dynasty were on its last half century.

Research trends in linguistics, general politics & government, and fiction show the same fluctuations over the 20 years, with declines during the second and the third periods, followed by rises in the fourth period. While research in linguistics increased in the fourth period, language research apart from linguistics has declined since the third period. While many topics show repeated ups and downs over the 20-year period, interest in Korean immigrant communities has grown rather steadily.

Disciplines and Journals

It seems natural for a journal's coverage to gain breadth as it publishes a large number of articles over a span of years, and that certainly applies to the four journals in Korean studies. The *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* (*HJAS*) and the *Journal of Asian Studies* (*JAS*), which published only 7 and 11 articles respectively for 20 years, have the least coverage of subjects; *Korean Studies* (*KS*), which published 128 articles, has covered all of the 14 disciplines. Some areas of subject concentration in the four journals can be seen in Table 6.

Over 50% of the Korean studies articles published in *HJAS*, *JAS*, and the *Journal of Korean Studies* (*JKS*) were in the field of history, far more than the average (33.7%) for all four journals. Of course, the fourth journal, *KS*, published less than the average.

Table 6. Disciplines and Journals

	<i>HJAS</i>	<i>JAS</i>	<i>JKS</i>	<i>KS</i>	Total
Anthropology & Sociology	1 14.3%	1 9.1%	5 10.6%	14 10.9%	21 10.9%
Arts		1 9.1%		3 2.3%	4 2.1%
Biography				1 0.8%	1 0.5%
Communication & Media		1 9.1%		2 1.6%	3 1.6%
Economics		2 18.2%	5 10.6%	10 7.8%	17 8.8%
Education				1 0.8%	1 0.5%
General & Miscellaneous				1 0.8%	1 0.5%
Geography				1 0.8%	1 0.5%
History	4 57.1%	6 54.5%	22 46.8%	33 25.8%	65 33.7%
Language			2 4.3%	16 12.5%	18 9.3%
Literature			2 4.3%	21 16.4%	23 11.9%
Philosophy & Religion	2 28.6%		6 12.8%	5 3.9%	13 6.7%
Politics & Government			4 8.5%	19 14.8%	23 11.9%
Science & Technology			1 2.1%	1 0.8%	2 1.0%
	7	11	47	128	193
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Above-average numbers also appear for *JAS*'s coverage of economics and for *HJAS*'s and *JKS*'s coverage of philosophy & religion. Also noteworthy is *JKS*'s weak coverage of language and literature.

Authors of the Source Articles

Altogether, 150 authors published 193 articles in the four journals over the 20 years. Little collaboration is evident: 184 articles were produced by single authors; 8 by two co-authors; and 1 by three.

The Major Contributing Authors

As seen in Table 7, James B. Palais published the most articles (six, or 3.1%), including two review articles. He is followed by Jonathan W. Best, Fujiya Kawashima, Kwang-rin Lee, Young Ick Lew, and David R. McCann. All five authors published four articles, even though one of Best's articles is a research note and another is a review article. Eight authors published three articles each and sixteen authors two articles each (16%). Two authors contributed 1.5 articles and the remaining 118 authors published one or less articles.

Lotka's law, which "suggests a few authors are prolific and account for a relatively large percent of the publications in the field. . . . an inverse relation between the number of documents produced and the number of authors producing the documents (Diodato 1994)", does not apply to this group of authors who published in the four journals. It does not seem reasonable to consider the core to consist of the 14 authors (out of 150, or 9.4%) who published 26% of all articles.

Table 7. The Major Contributing Authors

	1977-81	1982-86	1987-91	1992-96	Total	Cumulative %
Palais, James B.	2 3.8%	3 7.1%		1 1.9%	6 3.1%	3.1%
Kawashima, Fujiya	2 3.8%	1 2.4%		1 1.9%	4 2.1%	5.2%
Lee, Kwang-rin	1 1.9%	1 2.4%	2 4.3%		4 2.1%	7.3%
Lew, Young Ick	2 3.8%	1 2.4%	1 2.2%		4 2.1%	9.3%
McCann, David R.			2 4.3%	2 3.8%	4 2.1%	11.4%
Best, Jonathan W.	2 3.8%	1 2.4%	1 2.2%		4 2.1%	13.5%
Baker, Donald Leslie		1 2.4%	1 2.2%	1 1.9%	3 1.6%	15.0%
Ch'oe, Yong-ho	2 3.8%	1 2.4%			3 1.6%	16.6%
Duncan, John B.			2 4.3%	1 1.9%	3 1.6%	18.1%
Lee, Chae-Jin	1 1.9%		1 2.2%	1 1.9%	3 1.6%	19.7%
Pihl, Marshall R.	2 3.8%			1 1.9%	3 1.6%	21.2%
Robinson, Michael F.		3 7.1%			3 1.6%	22.8%
Shultz, Edward J.	1 1.9%	1 2.4%	1 2.2%		3 1.6%	24.4%
Miller, Roy Andrew	1 1.9%	1 2.4%	1 2.2%		3 1.6%	25.9%
Subtotal	16 30.4%	14 33.4%	12 26.1%	8 15.2%	50 25.9%	
16 authors contributing 2 articles each					32 16.0%	41.9%
2 authors contributing 1.5 articles each					3 1.6%	43.5%
118 authors contributing 1 or less article each					118 56.5%	100.0%

Another noteworthy finding is that these fourteen authors made most of their contributions to the field rather earlier in the timespan studied. They contributed over 30% of all articles published during the first and the second periods, then contributed a smaller and smaller proportion, contributing only 15.2% by the fourth period. This may indicate that more and more authors became interested and productive in Korean studies during the third and the fourth periods.

Authors and Journals

Authors may be partial to particular journals. Table 8 shows that most of the authors who contributed more than three articles published them in only one or two journals. Furthermore, 12 of the 16 individual authors who contributed two articles published them in just one journal.

Country of Origin of Authors in Korean Studies

In North America, non-Koreans have been the most active authors in Korean studies, followed by authors of Korean ethnicity (Table 9). Americans have contributed the most to Korean studies by publishing 39.9% of all the articles in the four journals for the past 20 years. Although their contribution has been gradually declining since the end of the second period (1982-1986), they still remain the most active group.

Korean-Americans authored 30.2% of the articles published in the first period. That rate dropped to 16.7% in the second period, but has been rising then. While Westerners made the most active contributions to Korean studies in North America during the early years, scholars of Korean ethnicity had achieved parity (at 44.2%) by the fourth period.

Table 8. Authors and Journals

	<i>HJAS</i>	<i>JAS</i>	<i>JKS</i>	<i>KS</i>	Total
Palais, James B.	2		4		6
Kawashima, Fujiya			3	1	4
Lee, Kwang-rin				4	4
Lew, Young Ick			3	1	4
McCann, David R.			1	3	4
Best, Jonathan W.	2	1		1	4
Baker, Donald Leslie			1	2	3
Ch'oe, Yong-ho		1		2	3
Duncan, John B.			1	2	3
Lee, Chae-Jin				3	3
Pihl, Marshall R.				3	3
Miller, Roy Andrew			2	1	3
Robinson, Michael F.			2	1	3
Shultz, Edward J.			1	2	3
Clark, Donald N.				2	2
Cumings, Bruce			2		2
Deuchler, Martina			2		2
Haboush, Jahyun Kim	1		1		2
Kalton, Michael C.			2		2
Kihl, Young Whan			1	1	2
Kim, Chin-Wu				2	2
Kim, Kichung				2	2
Koh, Byung Chul				2	2
Kwôn, Youngmin				2	2
Ledyard, Gari			1	1	2
Martin, Samuel E.				2	2
McNamara, Dennis L.		1		1	2
Robinson, Kenneth R.				2	2
Sorensen, Clark W.			2		2
Suh, Dae-Sook				2	2

Table 9. Country of Origin of Authors in Korean Studies

		1977- 81	1982- 86	1987- 91	1992- 96	Sub- total	Total
Westerner	American	21 39.6%	18 42.9%	19 41.3%	19 36.5%	77 39.9%	91 47.2%
	European	2 3.8%	2 4.8%	3 6.5%	3 5.8%	10 5.2%	
	Westerner in Korea	1 1.9%	1 2.4%		1 1.9%	3 1.6%	
	Westerner in Japan	1 1.9%				1 0.5%	
Korean	Korean-American	16 30.2%	7 16.7%	9 19.6%	14 26.9%	46 23.8%	75 38.8%
	Korean in Korea	5 9.4%	8 19.0%	6 13.0%	9 17.3%	28 14.5%	
	Korean and Kor.-American	1 1.9%				1 0.5%	
Korean and Other	Korean and American		1 2.4%	2 4.3%		3 1.6%	8 4.2%
	Kor.-American and American			1 2.2%	1 1.9%	2 1.0%	
	Kor.-American and European				1 1.9%	1 0.5%	
	Kor.-European and American		1 2.4%			1 0.5%	
	Korean, Kor.-American, and American			1 2.2%		1 0.5%	
Asian	Japanese-American	2 3.8%	2 4.8%	1 2.2%	2 3.8%	7 3.6%	19 9.8%
	Japanese in Japan	3 5.7%		2 4.3%	1 1.9%	6 3.1%	
	Chinese-American	1 1.9%			1 1.9%	2 1.0%	
	Chinese in China			2 4.3%		2 1.0%	
	Central Asian		1 2.4%			1 0.5%	
	Asian-American		1 2.4%			1 0.5%	
Total		53 100.0%	42 100.0%	46 100.0%	52 100.0%	193 100.0%	193 100.0%

It is interesting that all collaborations have occurred between Koreans and Westerners or between Koreans. There were no co-authored works without Koreans involved. Another noteworthy fact is the Japanese's interest on Korea. Among authors of Asian descent, Japanese were the most active in Korean studies in North America.

Country of Origin of Authors and Subject Distribution

People of different backgrounds have tended to have differing academic interests. Americans, Europeans, and Japanese-Americans have had greater interest in history than Koreans or Korean-Americans (Table 10). While Korean-Americans are more interested in politics & government than in Korea's economics, Koreans published more articles in economics than politics & government.

No Korean authors published articles on philosophy & religion, while Americans and Europeans have shown relatively high interest in the topic. Another interesting phenomenon is that, while Japanese authors demonstrated more interest in Korean anthropology & sociology and politics & government, Japanese-Americans showed more interest in Korean history. However, it should be noted that a single author accounted for 4 out of 5 articles in history. The subject areas engendering the most collaborative work were economics, politics & government, and anthropology & sociology.

Institutional Affiliation of Authors

The 150 authors in this study were affiliated with 97 different institutions. Two were not affiliated with any institution at the time they published their articles, and two were with non-academic institutions. These were counted as four different institutions.

Table 10. Country of Origin of Authors and Subject Distribution

	Amer.	Co-author	Euro.	Jap.	Jap.-Amer.	Kor.	Kor-Amer.	Other	Total
Anth. & Soc.	9 11.7%	2 22.2%	1 10.0%	2 33.3%	2 28.6%	2 7.1%	3 6.5%		21 10.9%
Arts	2 2.6%					1 3.6%	1 2.2%		4 2.1%
Economics	4 5.2%	3 33.3%	1 10.0%			4 14.3%	4 8.7%	1 10.0%	17 8.8%
History	32 41.6%	1 11.1%	4 40.0%	1 16.7%	5 71.4%	8 28.6%	10 21.7%	4 40.0%	65 33.7%
Language	5 6.5%					5 17.9%	6 13.0%	2 20.0%	18 9.3%
Literature	8 10.4%		1 10.0%			5 17.9%	7 15.2%	2 20.0%	23 11.9%
Phil. & Rel.	8 10.4%		2 20.0%				3 6.5%		13 6.7%
Pol. & Gov.	5 6.5%	3 33.3%	1 10.0%	3 50.0%		1 3.6%	10 21.7%		23 11.9%
Other	4 5.2%					2 7.1%	2 4.5%	1 10.0%	9 4.7%
Total	77 100%	9 100%	10 100%	6 100%	7 100%	28 100%	46 100%	10 100%	193 100%

Authors at the University of Hawaii have published the most articles in the four journals, followed by the University of Washington. Institutions whose authors published more than three articles are listed in the Table 11. Among academic institutions in Korea, Seoul National University is most represented in the four North American area studies journals.

Over a 20-year period, 19 authors at the University of Hawaii published 24 articles. This can be interpreted as an indication that there are very few steady

contributors at the institution. The same can be said for the University of Washington, except James B. Palais who published 6 articles. More or less the same is true for the other institutions listed. This may indicate that authors in Korean studies frequently change affiliations, not staying long at any one institution. It may also indicate that authors tend to begin publishing their articles while students, and then move to other institutions after earning their degrees. It is also possible that authors contributed only one or two articles to the four journals in Korean studies, and published other articles in disciplinary journals. This should be explored in future studies. Another noteworthy fact

Table 11. Institutional Affiliation of Authors

Institution	Number of Articles	Number of Authors
University of Hawaii	24	19
University of Washington, Seattle	18	10
Seoul National University, Korea	9	8
Harvard University	6.33	8
Korea University, Korea	5.33	5
Bowling Green State University	4	1
Georgetown University	4	3
Sogang University, Korea	4	1
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	4	2
Wesleyan University	4	1
Columbia University	3	2
Cornell University	3	1
University of California at Berkeley	3	4
University of California, Los Angeles	3	3
University of Delaware	3	3
University of Kansas	3	3
University of Southern California	3	1

is that many of the authors active in Korean studies are at institutions without established Korean studies programs. In fact, as mentioned in the introductory chapter, only about 20 institutions have Korean studies programs.

Table 12 shows institutional preferences for certain journals. Since individual author preferences for certain journals have already been discussed, Table 12 excludes institutions with only one author, from among those listed in Table 11.

The University of Hawaii, the University of Washington, and Harvard University have their own affiliated journals. *KS* is published at the University of Hawaii; *JKS* was established at the University of Washington, where its editorial offices were located until 1989; and *HJAS* is published by the Harvard-Yenching Institute at Harvard University.

Table 12. Author's Institutional Affiliation and Journal

	<i>HJAS</i>	<i>JAS</i>	<i>JKS</i>	<i>KS</i>	Total
Hawaii		3	1	20	24
Washington	2		11	5	18
Seoul		1	1	7	9
Harvard	.33		3	3	6.33
Korea	.33		2	3	5.33
Georgetown		1		3	4
Ill. UC	1		1	2	4
Columbia			2	1	3
Kansas		1	1	1	3
Berkeley			1	2	3
UCLA				3	3
Other	5	5	25	81	116
Total	7	11	47	128	193

With the exception of Harvard, it is clear that authors prefer their own institution's affiliated journal. This is most noticeable with the University of Hawaii. Authors at other institutions also show relative preferences for one or two journals, instead of publishing in a greater variety of journals.

Institutional Affiliation of Authors and Subject Distribution

As may be expected, institutions with many authors have more articles published in a wider range of disciplines (Table 13). The two most productive institutions both yielded a much larger number of articles in history than in any other disciplines. However, they differ in other respects. While authors at the University of Hawaii have demonstrated more interest in economics and politics & government than those at the University of Washington, the latter have shown more interest in philosophy & religion than the former. Another item to note is that, where one institution has more than two authors, those authors tend to publish in disparate areas, rather than in the same discipline.

Table 13. Institutions and Subject Distribution

	Anth. & Soc.	Arts	Econ.	His.	Lang.	Lit.	Phil. & Rel.	Pol. & Gov.	Other	Total
Hawaii (19)	2	1	3	11	2	2		3		24
Washington (10)	1	1	1	7	3	1	2	1	1	18
Seoul (8)	1	1		2	1	4				9
Harvard (8)	1		1.33			2		2		6.33
Korea (5)			2.33	2		1				5.33
Bowling (1)				4						4
Georgetown (3)			2	1				1		4
Sogang (1)				3					1	4
Ill. UC (2)				1	2		1			4
Wesleyan (3)		1		2			1			4
Columbia (2)				2		1				3
Cornell (1)						3				3
Delaware (2)	1		1	1						3
Kansas (3)	2							1		3
Berkeley (4)	1			1			1			3
UCLA (3)	1					1	1			3
USC (1)				3						3
Indiana (3)			0.5	2						2.5
Yonsei (3)			1					0.5	1	2.5
Iowa State (1)								2		2
Oxford (2)				2						2
San Jose (1)						2				2
Trinity (1)				2						2
UBC (1)							1		1	2
Ill. Chicago (1)								2		2
Yale (1)					2					2
Other	11		4.84	19	8	6	6	10.5	5	70.34
Total	21	4	17	65	18	23	13	23	9	193

Note. The numbers in parentheses indicate the number of authors from the institution in order to provide a better understanding of the degree of subject dispersion in different institutions.

CHAPTER 5

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LITERATURE CITED I:

CITATION FREQUENCY, FORM, AND AGE

The analysis of references cited within the articles published in the four Asian or Korean studies journals is designed to identify characteristics of the literature used by Korean studies community. As seen in chapter 4 'Source Articles,' only a few articles were published in some disciplines (Table 4) or by some author groups (Table 10). For example, only one article was published in biography, education, general & miscellaneous, geography; four were published in the arts, but one of them does not provide any references; three were published in communication & media, but one had no references; and only two were published in science & technology. Analyses of the articles in those disciplines or author groups will not offer any valid generalization. Therefore, the analyses of citations within different disciplines and/or by various author groups will include only disciplines or author groups represented by more than three articles, each with full references.

Number of Citations

All together 7,166 citations appeared in the 193 articles in the four journals over the 20-year period. The average citation per article was 37.13, with a minimum of zero and a maximum of 166 citations in an article. The average number of citations per article

is given in Table 14 by year of publication of the source articles, in Table 15 by source journals, and in Table 16 by disciplines.

Noticeable differences are found among journals and among disciplines, but not much by year of publication. Articles in philosophy & religion, politics & government, history, and anthropology & sociology generally have a large number of references. Articles in literature, on the other hand, have very few references.

Table 14. Number of Citations by Year of Publication

	1977-81	1982-86	1987-91	1992-96
Avg.	39.94	36.05	34.04	37.87
Min.	0	3	0	0
Max.	169	115	117	137

Table 15. Number of Citations by Journal

	<i>HJAS</i>	<i>JAS</i>	<i>JKS</i>	<i>KS</i>
Avg.	62.43	40.91	46.72	31.90
Min.	15	0	2	0
Max.	115	85.00	117.00	169.00

Table 16. Number of Citations by Discipline

	Anth. & Soc.	Econ.	Hist.	Lang.	Lit.	Phil. & Rel.	Pol. & Gov.
Avg.	40.00	35.12	43.77	30.44	17.30	48.77	44.35
Min.	4	7	0	0	0	4	0
Max.	116	85	169	104	61	115	145

Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies (HJAS) has the largest average number of citations and *Korean Studies (KS)* has the smallest. The *Journal of Asian Studies (JAS)* and the *Journal of Korean Studies (JKS)* also show some differences. This difference in journals might be a result of several factors. One factor could be the form of citation. Reference lists or bibliographies tend to have fewer referenced items than footnotes or endnotes. Another factor could be the subject matter of articles, as discussed in chapter 2, 'Literature Review.' When considering the differences in the average number of citations in different disciplines shown in the Table 16, the difference between journals (Table 15) is not irrelevant to the disciplines which the articles in each journal covered, shown in the Table 6 'Disciplines and Journals'. For example, *HJAS* published articles only on history, philosophy & religion, and anthropology & sociology, which have higher numbers of references (Table 16). In contrast, *KS* has the lowest average number of citations, since it not only published articles in all disciplines but also published most of the articles (16 out of 18) on literature, which has the lowest average number of references. The same observations can be made in the cases of *JAS* and *JKS*.

Form of Publication

Distribution of the form of publications for the 20-year period is shown in Table 17. Monographic literature was used most in Korean studies as a whole, accounting for 59 percent of all materials used. Within monographic literature, the book format (general and also governmental) was used most, followed by collections of the work of one or several authors. Among serial publications, periodicals were the most used format.

Table 17. Form of Publication

	1977-81	1982-86	1987-91	1992-96	Total
Monographs					
Books	827 39.1%	680 44.9%	675 43.1%	699 35.5%	2,881 40.2%
Collections	307 14.5%	222 14.7%	226 14.4%	348 17.7%	1,103 15.4%
Pamphlets	4 0.2%	2 0.1%	8 0.5%	8 0.4%	22 0.3%
Government					
Books	61 2.9%	28 1.8%	52 3.3%	24 1.2%	165 2.3%
Collections	15 0.7%	6 0.4%	6 0.4%	15 0.8%	42 0.6%
Pamphlets	5 0.2%			4 0.2%	9 0.1%
Subtotal	1,219 57.6%	638 61.9%	967 61.7%	1,098 55.2%	4,222 59.0%
Serials					
Periodicals	647 30.6%	394 26.0%	327 20.9%	376 19.1%	1,744 24.3%
Annuals	9 0.4%	6 0.4%	9 0.6%	12 0.6%	36 0.5%
Newspapers	94 4.4%	76 5.0%	110 7.0%	340 17.3%	620 8.7%
Government					
Periodicals	20 0.9%	2 0.1%	16 1.0%	21 1.1%	59 0.8%
Annuals	12 0.6%	1 0.1%	15 1.0%	5 0.3%	33 0.5%
Newspapers				3 0.2%	3 0.0%
Subtotal	782 36.9%	479 31.6%	477 30.5%	757 38.6%	2,495 34.8%

(table continue)

Table 17. *(continued)*

	1977-81	1982-86	1987-91	1992-96	Total
Unpublished					
Theses	40 1.9%	47 3.1%	46 2.9%	23 1.2%	156 2.2%
Government	32 1.5%	8 0.5%	10 0.6%	20 1.0%	70 1.0%
Personal	22 1.0%	21 1.4%	33 2.1%	35 1.8%	111 1.5%
Subtotal	94 4.4%	76 5.0%	89 5.6%	78 4.0%	337 4.7%
Other					
Interviews	6 0.3%		27 1.7%	18 0.9%	51 0.7%
Miscellaneous	3 0.1%	2 0.1%	1 0.1%	14 0.7%	20 0.3%
News items	11 0.5%	17 1.1%	3 0.2%	1 0.1%	32 0.4%
Unknown	2 0.1%	2 0.1%	2 0.1%	3 0.2%	9 0.1%
Subtotal	22 1.0%	21 1.3%	33 2.1%	36 1.9%	112 1.5%
Total	2,117 100.0%	1,514 100.0%	1,566 100.0%	1,969 100.0%	7,166 100.0%

However, the use of periodicals decreased from 30.6% in 1977-81 to 19.1% in 1992-96.

A very noticeable change is the usage rate of newspapers, which sharply increased from well under 10% during the first three periods to 17.3% in the fourth period.

Other formats fluctuate without showing any clear trends. For example, the use of unpublished theses went up to 3.1% in the second period then went down to 1.2% in the fourth period. The use of unpublished government materials dropped in the second and the third periods then rose again in the fourth period. One article in the fourth period cited

many miscellaneous forms such as speech, testimony, statements, film and video, raising the numbers in that category. Here the 'news' items denote broadcast media, wire services, and other news services. The authors must have cited the information from written documents, for example, United States Foreign Broadcast Information Service's daily report, but they did not explicitly say so. Instead of assuming such sources, these cases were just categorized as 'news' items for this study. The high usage of this format in the first and second period resulted from references in only one or two articles in each period. Therefore, it is not reasonable to say that its use has declined in the third and the fourth period.

Disciplines and Form of Publication

History and politics & government cited the widest variety of formats, as shown in Table 18. In contrast, articles on language cited the smallest variety of formats. Monographic literature was the most highly cited format in all disciplines except politics & government. While references to monographic literature in politics & government accounted for 42.8%, such references accounted for more than 50% in all the other disciplines. Generally, monographs were more heavily cited in disciplines within the humanities than within the social sciences. Economics and language show somewhat different patterns. Economics cited more monographs than the other disciplines within the social sciences, while the overall citations of monographs on language were lower than in other disciplines in the humanities. Citations to collective works were high in literature and in philosophy & religion, because of many citations to collections and selections of literary works.

Table 18. Disciplines and Form of Publication

	Anth. & Soc.	Econ.	Hist.	Lang.	Lit.	Phil. & Rel	Pol. & Gov.	Total
Monographs								
Books	311 37.0%	244 40.9%	1,156 40.6%	227 41.4%	191 48.0%	330 52.1%	280 27.5%	2,881 40.2%
Collections	109 13.0%	95 15.9%	436 15.3%	62 11.3%	116 29.1%	129 20.3%	103 10.1%	1,103 15.4%
Pamphlets	7 0.8%	4 0.7%	2 0.1%		1 0.3%	1 0.2%	5 0.5%	22 0.3%
Government								
Books	10 1.2%	36 6.0%	69 2.4%		1 0.3%	12 1.9%	30 2.9%	165 2.3%
Collections	1 0.1%	2 0.3%	26 0.9%		1 0.3%	1 0.2%	10 1.0%	42 0.6%
Pamphlets			1 0.0%				8 0.8%	9 0.6%
Subtotal	438 52.1%	381 63.8%	1,690 59.3%	289 52.7%	310 78.0%	473 74.7%	436 42.8%	4,222 59.0%
Serials								
Periodicals	154 18.3%	124 20.8%	786 27.6%	222 40.5%	56 14.1%	121 19.1%	230 22.5%	1,744 24.3%
Annuals	3 0.4%	9 1.5%	8 0.3%	7 1.3%			7 0.7%	36 0.5%
Newspapers	169 20.1%	8 1.3%	187 6.6%	5 0.9%	16 4.0%	7 1.1%	224 22.0%	620 8.7%
Government								
Periodicals		7 1.2%	13 0.5%			1 0.2%	38 3.7%	59 0.8%
Annuals		14 2.3%	3 0.1%			1 0.2%	7 0.7%	33 0.5%
Newspapers							3 0.3%	3 .0%
Subtotal	326 38.8%	162 27.1%	997 35.1%	234 42.7%	72 18.0%	130 20.6%	509 49.9%	2,495 34.8%

(table continue)

Table 18. (continued)

	Anth. & Soc.	Econ.	Hist.	Lang.	Lit.	Phil. & Rel	Pol. & Gov.	Total
Unpublished								
Theses	20 2.4%	23 3.9%	60 2.1%	19 3.5%	3 .8%	18 2.8%	11 1.1%	156 2.2%
Government	1 0.1%	7 1.2%	50 1.8%		1 0.3%	6 0.9%	5 0.5%	70 1.0%
Personal	25 3.0%	13 2.2%	28 1.0%	6 1.1%	8 2.0%	5 .8%	22 2.2%	111 1.5%
Subtotal	46 5.5%	43 7.3%	138 4.9%	25 4.6%	12 3.1%	29 4.5%	38 3.8%	337 4.7%
Other								
Interviews	18 2.1%	10 1.7%	5 0.2%		2 0.5%		9 0.9%	51 0.7%
Misc.	10 1.2%		4 0.1%		2 0.5%	1 0.2%	2 0.2%	20 0.3%
News items			8 0.3%				24 2.4%	32 0.4%
Unknown	2 0.2%	1 0.2%	3 0.1%			1 0.2%	2 0.2%	9 0.1%
Subtotal	30 3.5%	11 1.9%	20 0.7%		4 1.0%	2 0.4%	37 3.7%	112 1.5%
Total	840 100%	597 100%	2845 100%	548 100%	398 100%	634 100%	1,020 100%	7,166 100%

Note. The row totals are for Korean studies as a whole.

Just as citations to monographs were high, ranging between 42.8 percent and 78 percent, citations to serials were accordingly low, from 18 percent to 49.9 percent. The citation rate to serials in humanities was lower than to those in social sciences, again with the exception of economics and language. Articles in economics and in politics & government cited more monographs and serials published by governments than any other

disciplines. Also noteworthy was the higher usage of unpublished theses in articles on economics and on language.

The disciplinary differences presented in Table 18 seem to account for other changes over the four 5-year periods shown in Table 17. For example, the high productivity in history and in philosophy & religion during the second period, and in history and economics during the third period (as shown in Table 4), raised the citation rates to monographs during those periods, since each of those disciplines has high citation rates for monographic literature. Conversely, the high productivity in politics & government and in anthropology & sociology lowered the citation rates for monographic literature during the fourth period (while raising citation rates to serials, mainly newspapers).

Disciplines, Country of Origin of Authors, and Form of Publication

Different patterns with regard to the format of publications cited by certain author groups in various disciplines were examined. Table 35 in Appendix A shows the forms of publication cited by American, Korean, and Korean-American authors in economics. Differences among author groups are not consistent throughout the formats. Nonetheless, some patterns can be discerned. Koreans cited more monographs than Americans or Korean-Americans, and accordingly fewer serials than the other groups did. Korean-Americans tended to use more unpublished materials, such as theses and unpublished conference papers and interviews, than did other groups.

All author groups except Japanese-Americans in history cited monographic literature over 60 percent of the time, twice as often as serials (Table 36 in Appendix A).

European authors made the most use of monographs (70.6%) and the least use of serials (27.4%). Interestingly, Japanese-American authors in history cited serials over 50 percent (53.7%) of the time and monographs only 44.1 percent, while European authors in history used more newspapers than any other groups. However, it should be noted that a single author accounted for 4 out of 5 articles in Japanese-American historian group.

American and Korean historians used more unpublished theses than any other groups. Almost all of such theses were produced in U.S. Among theses produced in Korea, master's theses were used more than Ph.D. theses (5 to 2). Americans were the greatest users of unpublished materials, especially government archives.

Korean-American authors on language show very different citation behavior in terms of form of publication from their American and Korean counterparts (Table 37 in Appendix A). Only 37.3 percent of their citations were to monographs, compared to over 60 percent for the others. These different citation patterns did not seem to correlate with any differences in subject matter. This low citation rate to monographic literature raised the proportion of citations to serials to almost twice that of other author groups in the field. The very different citation behavior of Korean-American authors accounted for the field's very different citation patterns compared to other disciplines in the humanities, as shown in Table 18.

As seen in Table 38 in Appendix A, different author groups in literature show almost uniform citation patterns, that is, very high citation rates to monographs, and therefore low rates to serials. As for author groups, Koreans cited books and collected

works in relatively even proportions, while Americans and Korean-Americans cited far more books than collected works.

While American authors in politics & government cited more general books than Korean-Americans did, Korean-Americans cited more monographic literature published by governments than Americans did (Table 39 in Appendix A). Another notable difference is that, while Americans used more periodicals, Korean-Americans used newspapers far more than did Americans.

Age of Publication

Table 19 shows the timespan of the citations received for each of the four periods as well as the total for the study. Since many classic works have been reprinted or translated in later periods, sometimes in many different versions or printings, the years of original creation for such works were also considered. A second set of age distribution data was created by replacing dates of reprints or translations with their dates of original creation. The mean and median ages of the original works are provided at the bottom of Table 19. For total timespan studied, the mean age of publications cited was 20.87 (57.67 for original creations). The median age of publications cited was 12 (14 for original creations). The oldest publications were used during the second period and the most recent ones during the fourth period.

The Price Index of Korean studies as a whole, which measures the percentage of references to works published in the most recent five-year period, is 21.9 percent for the 20-year timespan, which is approximates the upper limit for fields in the humanities and the lower limit for social sciences. Materials 6 to 10 years old received the largest

Table 19. Age of Publication

	1977-81	1982-86	1987-91	1992-96	Total
0-5	460 21.7%	250 16.5%	350 22.3%	510 25.9%	1,570 21.9%
6-10	476 22.5%	307 20.3%	316 20.2%	369 18.7%	1,468 20.5%
11-15	335 15.8%	244 16.1%	173 11.0%	242 12.3%	994 13.9%
16-20	259 12.2%	144 9.5%	178 11.4%	154 7.8%	735 10.3%
21-25	129 6.1%	114 7.5%	119 7.6%	139 7.1%	501 7.0%
26-30	67 3.2%	55 3.6%	95 6.1%	90 4.6%	307 4.3%
31-35	78 3.7%	42 2.8%	51 3.3%	132 6.7%	303 4.2%
36-40	34 1.6%	28 1.8%	23 1.5%	22 1.1%	107 1.5%
41-45	55 2.6%	38 2.5%	21 1.3%	26 1.3%	140 2.0%
46-50	32 1.5%	46 3.0%	37 2.4%	63 3.2%	178 2.5%
51-55	17 0.8%	21 1.4%	44 2.8%	15 0.8%	97 1.4%
56-60	15 0.7%	18 1.2%	29 1.9%	23 1.2%	85 1.2%
61-65	6 0.3%	21 1.4%	22 1.4%	16 0.8%	65 0.9%
66-70	11 0.5%	9 0.6%	24 1.5%	10 0.5%	54 0.8%
71-75	12 0.6%	10 0.7%	9 0.6%	39 2.0%	70 1.0%
76-80	15 0.7%	8 0.5%	4 0.3%	13 0.7%	40 0.6%

(table continue)

Table 19. *(continued)*

	1977-81	1982-86	1987-91	1992-96	Total
81-85	18 .9%	3 .2%	6 .4%	12 .6%	39 .5%
86-90	29 1.4%	74 4.9%	1 .1%	18 .9%	122 1.7%
91-95	2 .1%	1 .1%	8 .5%	14 .7%	25 .3%
96-100	3 .1%	4 .3%	6 .4%	8 .4%	21 .3%
101-200	4 0.1%	3 0.3%	7 0.6%	3 .2%	17 0.2%
201-300	4 0.1%	5 0.4%	4 0.3%	1 0.1%	14 0.1%
301-400	4 0.1%	2 0.2%	2 0.2%		8 0.1%
401-1,010	2 0.1%				2 0.0%
unknown	50 2.4%	67 4.4%	37 2.4%	50 2.5%	204 2.8%
Total	2,117 100.0%	1,514 100.0%	1,566 100.0%	1,969 100.0%	7,166 100.0%
Mean	19.68	23.80	20.92	19.91	20.87
Median	12.00	14.00	13.00	12.00	12.00
Range	0-1,003	0-384	0-343	0-291	0-1,003
Age Distribution from the Original Dates of Creation					
Mean	52.75	78.75	57.75	46.74	57.67
Median	13.00	17.00	14.00	13.00	14.00
Range	0-2,067	0-1,890	0-2,076	0-1,795	0-2,076

percentage of citations during the first and second periods, and materials 0 to 5 years old received the largest during the third and the fourth periods. Authors in Korean studies cited more current publications in the more recent periods, with the exception of the second period. As with the changes in the form of publications, this change in age distribution over the 20-year timespan can be easily understood in light of the disciplines

that were active during the second period and their age dispersion patterns, as shown in Table 20.

Disciplines and Age of Publication

It is shown in Table 20 that disciplines in the social sciences, such as anthropology & sociology, economics, and politics & government mostly cited sources published within the previous 5 years, while disciplines in the humanities, such as history, language, literature, and philosophy & religion cited more sources 6-10 years old than 0-5 years old.

Articles in politics & government cited more recent publications than any other disciplines. Their median age is 7, with 42% of all citations to publications 0-5 years old, and 65.8% to those 0-10 years old. Articles in anthropology & sociology rank second. The median age of their citations is 10, with 31.3% of citations to publications less than 6 years old, and 54.2% to those less than 11 years old. In contrast, the median ages for history, philosophy & religion, and literature range between 15 and 16, with only 13.4 to 18.3% of their citations to sources less than 6 years old, and 32.1% to 37.1% to those less than 11 years old. These disciplines were also the ones that cited many reprints and translations of primary sources, as indicated by the median ages of the second set of publication dates. This disciplinary difference explains why the age of citations during the second period was so much greater than in other periods (Table 19). That is, as shown in Table 4 'Disciplines in Korean Studies,' while history and philosophy & religion peaked during the second period, politics & government and anthropology & sociology hit a trough.

Table 20. Disciplines and Age of Publication

	Anth.	Econ.	Hist.	Lang.	Lit.	Phil. & Rel.	Pol. & Gov.	Total
0-5	263 31.3%	140 23.5%	381 13.4%	123 22.4%	73 18.3%	93 14.7%	428 42.0%	1,570 21.9%
6-10	192 22.9%	126 21.1%	532 18.7%	130 23.7%	75 18.8%	117 18.5%	243 23.8%	1,468 20.5%
11-15	123 14.6%	86 14.4%	427 15.0%	97 17.7%	52 13.1%	77 12.1%	97 9.5%	994 13.9%
16-20	71 8.5%	47 7.9%	311 10.9%	78 14.2%	51 12.8%	76 12.0%	73 7.2%	735 10.3%
21-25	46 5.5%	51 8.5%	204 7.2%	31 5.7%	46 11.6%	63 9.9%	45 4.4%	501 7.0%
26-30	20 2.4%	38 6.4%	123 4.3%	24 4.4%	24 6.0%	28 4.4%	31 3.0%	307 4.3%
31-35	13 1.5%	7 1.2%	141 5.0%	12 2.2%	23 5.8%	19 3.0%	82 8.0%	303 4.2%
36-40	10 1.2%	9 1.5%	56 2.0%	6 1.1%	5 1.3%	11 1.7%	7 0.7%	107 1.5%
41-45	16 1.9%	7 1.2%	74 2.6%	8 1.5%	8 2.0%	16 2.5%	4 0.4%	140 2.0%
46-50	12 1.4%	25 4.2%	109 3.8%	6 1.1%	4 1.0%	11 1.7%	3 0.3%	178 2.5%
51-55	5 0.6%	25 4.2%	45 1.6%	6 1.1%	6 1.5%	4 0.6%	2 0.2%	97 1.4%
56-60	1 0.1%	18 3.0%	49 1.7%	7 1.3%	1 0.3%	7 1.1%	1 0.1%	85 1.2%
61-65	8 1.0%	5 0.8%	38 1.3%	3 0.5%	3 0.8%	7 1.1%		65 0.9%
66-70	6 0.7%	2 0.3%	39 1.4%	4 0.7%	1 0.3%	1 0.2%		54 0.8%
71-75	38 4.5%		22 .8%	3 0.5%	2 0.5%	2 0.3%	1 0.1%	70 1.0%
76-80	4 0.5%		32 1.1%	2 0.4%		2 0.3%		40 0.6%
81-85	1 .1%		19 .7%	2 .4%	9 2.3%	5 .8%		39 .5%

(table continue)

Table 20. (continued)

	Anth.	Econ.	Hist.	Lang.	Lit.	Phil. & Rel.	Pol. & Gov.	Total
86-90			113 4.0%	2 .4%	2 .5%	4 .6%		122 1.7%
91-95	1 .1%		9 .3%	1 .2%		12 1.9%		25 .3%
96-100	2 .2%		10 .4%	1 .2%	1 .3%	5 .8%		21 .3%
101-1,010	2 .2%		12 .4%	2 .4%	1 .3%	19 3.4%		41 .6%
unknown	6 .7%	11 1.8%	99 3.5%		11 2.8%	55 8.7%	3 .3%	204 2.8%
Total	840 100%	597 100%	2,845 100%	548 100%	398 100%	634 100%	1,020 100%	7,166 100%
Mean	17.45	17.91	25.72	16.49	19.84	28.62	10.78	20.87
Median	10.00	12.00	16.00	12.00	15.00	16.00	7.00	12.00
Range	0- 1,003	0-70	0-384	0-123	1-260	0-452	0-71	0- 1,003
Age Distribution from the Original Dates of Creation								
Mean	30.13	18.29	70.88	22.81	75.46	172.32	11.11	57.67
Median	10.00	12.00	19.00	12.00	17.00	21.00	7.00	14.00
Range	0- 1,450	0-138	0- 2,067	0- 1,313	1- 2,076	0- 1,577	0-71	0- 2,076

Note: The row totals are of all articles in Korean studies.

Another item to note is the relatively low percentage of recent sources cited in economics articles, countering the common perception that research in economics cites fairly recent sources. This could be partly because 6 out of 17 articles (35.29%) on economics were on economic history. It is also apparent that authors in economics and in politics & government hardly cite sources more than 50-60 years old, while authors in other disciplines extend their citations to sources 100 or more years old.

Disciplines, Country of Origin of Authors, and Age of Publication

While Korean and Korean-American authors in economics cited sources published mostly within the previous 15 years, American authors cited a fairly high percentage of retrospective sources (Table 40 in Appendix B). While Koreans and Korean-Americans made 25.4-29.4 percent of their references to sources published within the previous 5 years, Americans cited sources of similar age at the rate of only 10.7 percent. Their citation rate to sources published within the previous 10 years was not high, either. As the high percentage of citations to sources 46-55 years old indicates, 2 out of 4 articles by American authors were on the economic history of Korea's colonial period, 1910-1945. However, 2 out of 4 articles by Korean-American authors were also on the same subject. Close examination of the references revealed that one American author heavily cited not only primary, but also secondary sources published during the colonial period. The articles by Korean authors were all on present-day economics and, accordingly, 94 percent of their citations were to sources published within the previous 25 years. Comparison of the three author groups suggests that their different citation patterns simply reflect their choice of subject matter, which affected how current materials were used in research on Korean economics.

As for historians, Americans, Koreans, and Korean-Americans all show similar patterns in terms of the age of cited publications. They rely mostly on sources 6-10 years old, but Europeans and Japanese-Americans show some differences (Table 41 in Appendix B). While all other author groups within history most cited sources 6-10 years old, only Europeans cited more of the most current (0-5 years) sources (24.7%) than those

6-10 years old (16.1%). Japanese Americans, on the other hand, more heavily cited sources 11-15 years old (22.5%) than did any others (8.1-16.2%). However, this cannot be considered typical of Japanese-American authors in history, because a single author accounted for 4 out of 5 articles in this group.

As shown in Table 42 in Appendix B, American authors on language most cited sources 0-5 years old, while Koreans and Korean-Americans cited more sources 6-10 years old than 0-5 years old. It is also noteworthy that Korean authors on language hardly used sources more than 25 years old, while the other two groups sought information from sources as old as 70 or 75 years and beyond. A close examination of the titles of articles in the field of language reveals that articles by Americans or Korean-Americans contain some historical studies, while there are none by Korean authors.

American and Korean authors in literature most cited materials of the most recent vintage (0-5 years old), but Korean-Americans relied mostly on sources 6-10 years old (Table 43 in Appendix B). Koreans relied much more heavily on sources 0-5 years old and 16-25 years old and, like Korean authors on language, generally neglected sources more than 25 years old, unlike Americans and Korean-Americans.

The field of politics & government showed larger differences in the age of sources. American and Korean-American authors mainly cited sources in the range of 0-10 years old (Table 44 in Appendix B), but while Americans cited sources 6-10 years old for 42.6% of their references, Korean-Americans relied more on the most recent sources, those published within the previous 5 years. There were no particular subject matter differences among the author groups.

Form of Publication and Age Distribution

Among monographs, those 6-10 years old were cited most in Korean studies in general (Table 21). For serials, on the other hand, those published within 5 years received the most citations. Apart from that, the two formats do not show much difference in their distribution. The somewhat higher rates for serials 71-90 years old were due to citations of newspapers and news magazines published during the 1880s and 1890s in much historical research on Korea's opening period.

Dissertations and theses more than 30 years old were hardly cited at all. Those most cited were produced within the previous 10 years. As for unpublished conference papers, those produced within the previous 5 years received the most attention. Higher rates are shown for unpublished materials 31-35, 46-50, and 61-70 years old due to citations of archival materials.

Table 21. Age Distribution and Form of Publication

	Mono.	Serial	Thesis	MS.	Misc.	Unknow	Total
0-5	738	662	44	50	74	2	1,570
	17.5%	26.5%	28.2%	27.6%	71.8%	22.2%	21.9%
6-10	900	486	49	19	11	3	1,468
	21.3%	19.5%	31.4%	10.5%	10.7%	33.3%	20.5%
11-15	663	305	17	7	2		994
	15.7%	12.2%	10.9%	3.9%	1.9%		13.9%
16-20	470	236	24	4		1	735
	11.1%	9.5%	15.4%	2.2%		11.1%	10.3%
21-25	364	119	12	5	1		501
	8.6%	4.8%	7.7%	2.8%	1.0%		7.0%
26-30	220	74	5	4	4		307
	5.2%	3.0%	3.2%	2.2%	3.9%		4.3%
31-35	142	127	1	26	7		303
	3.4%	5.1%	.6%	14.4%	6.8%		4.2%
36-40	74	31		2			107
	1.8%	1.2%		1.1%			1.5%
41-45	95	40	2	3			140
	2.3%	1.6%	1.3%	1.7%			2.0%
46-50	92	78		8			178
	2.2%	3.1%		4.4%			2.5%
51-60	111	67	1	1	1	1	182
	2.6%	2.7%	.6%	.6%	1.0%	11.1%	2.6%
61-70	65	44	1	9			119
	1.5%	1.7%	.6%	5.0%			1.7%
71-80	41	63		5		1	110
	1.0%	2.5%		2.8%		11.1%	1.6%
81-90	39	119		3			161
	.9%	4.8%		1.7%			2.2%
91-100	13	31		2			46
	.3%	1.2%		1.1%			.6%
101-1,010	30	4		7			41
	.7%	.2%		4.1%			.4%
Unknown	165	9		26	3	1	204
	3.9%	.4%		14.4%	2.9%	11.1%	2.8%
Total	4,222	2,495	156	181	103	9	7,166
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

CHAPTER 6

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LITERATURE CITED II:

LANGUAGE, PLACE, AND SUBJECT

Language of Publication

As shown in "Literature Review", studies indicate that the language preferences of authors depend on the discipline, the location of subjects studied, the country of publication, or the native language of the author. Authors generally prefer to use literature in their own languages, especially English-speaking authors. Authors in humanities tend to use the highest percent of foreign-language materials, followed by authors in social sciences. In last place are authors in the natural sciences. Not many studies have been done on authors engaged in foreign area studies. Studies on American historians writing about the history of modern Germany showed that about 63 percent of such references were to the sources in German language (Peters, 1990).

The language distribution of publications cited by authors in Korean studies is presented in Table 22. Sources written in English were most cited, accounting for 47.1% of all sources cited. References to Korean language sources were only 30.2% of all sources. The term Hancha denotes Chinese writing used by Koreans before vernacular Korean was widely used in writing. Even if Hancha totals are added to the Korean language totals, the sum is only rises to 34.9 percent. Considering the respective quantities of sources published on Korea in English and in Korean, this is a surprisingly

Table 22. Language of Publication

	1977-81	1982-86	1987-91	1992-96	Total	Cumulative %
English	964 45.5%	658 43.5%	694 44.3%	1,059 53.8%	3,375 47.1%	47.1%
Korean	698 33.0%	434 28.7%	518 33.1%	511 26.0%	2,161 30.2%	77.3%
Japanese	243 11.5%	204 13.5%	194 12.4%	247 12.5%	888 12.4%	89.6%
Hancha	100 4.7%	101 6.7%	79 5.0%	55 2.8%	335 4.7%	94.3%
Chinese	26 1.2%	76 5.0%	43 2.7%	75 3.8%	220 3.1%	97.4%
German	39 1.8%	16 1.1%	11 0.7%	11 .6%	77 1.1%	98.5%
French	18 0.9%	9 0.6%	3 0.2%	4 0.2%	34 0.5%	98.9%
Russian	11 0.5%	11 0.7%	2 0.1%	1 0.1%	25 0.3%	99.3%
Kor/Eng	8 0.4%	3 0.2%	7 0.4%	1 0.1%	18 0.3%	99.6%
Han/Kor	1 0.0%		2 0.1%		3 0.0%	99.6%
Italian		1 0.1%			1 0.0%	99.6%
Turkish	1 0.0%				1 0.0%	99.6%
Jap/Eng	1 0.0%				1 0.0%	99.6%
Man/Eng	1 0.0%				1 0.0%	99.6%
Tur/Rus	1 0.0%				1 0.0%	99.6%
Unknown	5 0.2%	1 0.1%	13 0.9%	5 0.3%	24 0.4%	100.0%
Total	2,117 100.0%	1,514 100.0%	1,566 100.0%	1,969 100.0%	7,166 100.0%	

low percentage of citations to Korean sources (No statistics are available as to the relative quantities in each language, but the researcher is well aware of large disparities, based on her experience as a collection development librarian for Korean studies.). As observed by Shulman (1983), the lack of proficiency in Korean by American authors might be a major reason for this low use of sources in Korean. (This was mentioned in 'Literature Review'.) The other important language in Korean studies is Japanese, accounting for 12.4 percent of all sources cited.

The gap between usage of English and Korean sources widened during the period under study, so that by the fourth period English sources were used twice as much as Korean ones. Usage of sources in Japanese remained steady. There are not many works published on Korea in western languages other than English. Even taking this into account, the usage of such sources was still very limited. In fact, it has declined over the years.

Disciplines and Language of Publication

Articles in the social science disciplines relied on sources in English far more than on sources in Korean, as shown in Table 23. Politics & government relied most heavily on sources in English (74.4%). Its citation rate to Korean language sources was only 18.2%. Citations to Japanese- and Chinese-language sources in anthropology & sociology occurred primarily in studies of Korean immigrant communities in Japan and China. Interestingly, articles in economics did not cite sources other than in English, Korean, or Japanese. History and literature cited English and Korean sources in equal proportions. Since research in philosophy & religion rely heavily on primary sources written in

Table 23. Disciplines and Language of Publication

	Anth. & Soc.	Econ.	Hist.	Lang.	Lit.	Phil. & Rel.	Pol. & Gov.	Total
English	420 50.0%	354 59.3%	1,038 36.5%	236 43.1%	185 46.5%	231 36.4%	759 74.4%	3,375 47.1%
Korean	200 23.8%	144 24.1%	1,045 36.7%	151 27.6%	189 47.5%	186 29.3%	186 18.2%	2,161 30.2%
Japanese	123 14.6%	93 15.6%	450 15.8%	84 15.3%	4 1.0%	63 9.9%	50 4.9%	888 12.4%
Hancha	10 1.2%		190 6.7%	1 0.2%	10 2.5%	98 15.5%		335 4.7%
Chinese	65 7.7%		80 2.8%	2 0.4%	3 0.8%	50 7.9%	7 0.7%	220 3.1%
German	5 0.6%		13 0.5%	42 7.7%	4 1.0%	2 0.3%	5 0.5%	77 1.1%
French	2 0.2%		11 0.4%	11 2.0%	2 0.5%	3 0.5%	3 0.3%	34 0.5%
Russian			8 0.3%	13 2.4%	1 0.3%		3 0.3%	25 0.3%
Kor/Eng		4 0.7%	2 0.1%	4 0.7%			5 0.5%	18 0.3%
Han/Kor			3 0.1%					3 0.0%
Italian						1 0.2%		1 0.0%
Jap/Eng				1 0.2%				1 0.0%
Man/Eng				1 0.2%				1 0.0%
Tur/Rus				1 0.2%				1 0.0%
Turkish				1 0.2%				1 0.0%
Unknown	15 10.8%	2 0.4%	5 0.1%				2 0.2%	24 0.4%
Total	840 100.0%	597 100.0%	2,845 100.0%	548 100.0%	398 100.0%	634 100.0%	1,020 100.0%	7,166 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in Korean studies as a whole.

Hancha and/or sources from China, the citation rates for these languages were higher than in other disciplines. Researchers in the field of language cited sources in many languages other than English, Korean, Japanese, and Chinese. These differences in disciplines account for the changes shown over the periods in Table 22. For example, high productivity in politics & government during the fourth period (shown in Table 4) resulted in the highest percentage of citations to sources in English.

Translations from other languages into either English or Korean were examined to see if translated works have any impact on citation rates to sources in English or Korean. Results are shown in Table 24, along with the figures for the sources whose original language was either English or Korean. Some disciplines cited more translated sources than others. Literature was the field with the highest citation rate for sources translated from Korean into English. Also noteworthy are the translations from Korean or Japanese into English cited within anthropology & sociology; from Japanese into English cited within history and language; from Chinese, Japanese, French, and German into English within literature; from Korean, Chinese, and French into English within philosophy & religion; from Japanese into Korean within economics; and from Chinese into Korean within philosophy & religion. The most citations to Korean classics created in Hancha and translated into Korean were found in history, literature, and philosophy & religion.

Within this examination of translated sources, the only discipline that stands out is the field of literature. Since 14.2% of all sources cited in literature were translated works, when they are classified separately from the sources originally created in English, the

Table 24. Original Languages of Translated Sources

	Anth. & Soc.	Econ.	Hist.	Lang.	Lit.	Phil. & Rel.	Pol. & Gov.	Total
English	420 50.0%	354 59.3%	1,038 36.5%	236 43.1%	185 46.5%	231 36.4%	759 74.4%	3,375 47.1%
English	398 47.4%	345 57.7%	970 34.1%	228 41.6%	129 32.4%	196 30.9%	739 72.5%	3,151 44.1%
<u>Translations from:</u>								
Korean	10 1.2%	2 0.3%	22 0.8%	1 0.2%	34 8.5%	9 1.4%	8 0.8%	86 1.2%
Chinese	2 0.2%		16 0.6%	1 0.2%	7 1.8%	17 2.7%	2 0.2%	49 0.7%
Japanese	5 0.6%	1 0.2%	18 0.6%	5 0.9%	5 1.3%	1 0.2%	4 0.4%	39 0.5%
French	3 0.4%	4 0.7%	5 0.2%		7 1.8%	5 0.8%		25 0.3%
German	1 0.1%	1 0.2%	2 0.1%		2 0.5%	1 0.2%	1 0.1%	8 0.1%
Others	1 0.1%	1 0.2%	5 0.1%	1 0.2%	1 0.3%	2 0.3%	5 0.5%	17 0.2%
Subtotal	22 2.6%	9 1.6%	68 2.4%	8 1.5%	56 14.2%	35 5.5%	20 1.9%	224 3.0%
Korean	200 23.8%	144 24.1%	1,045 36.7%	151 27.6%	189 47.5%	186 29.3%	186 18.2%	2,161 30.2%
Korean	196 23.3%	136 22.8%	1,016 35.7%	150 27.4%	180 45.2%	172 27.0%	186 18.2%	2,092 29.2%
<u>Translations from:</u>								
Hancha	3 0.4%		21 0.7%		9 2.3%	8 1.3%		44 0.6%
Japanese	1 0.1%	8 1.3%	3 0.1%			1 0.2%		13 0.2%
Chinese			2 0.1%			5 0.8%		7 0.1%
Others			3 0.1%	1 0.2%				5 0.1%
Subtotal	4 0.5%	8 1.3%	29 1.0%	1 0.2%	9 2.3%	14 2.3%		69 1.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in Korean studies as a whole.

percentage of sources in English drops from 46.5% to 32.4%. The field of philosophy & religion shows the next significant divergence along the same lines, but exclusion of translations does not change the ratio of English to Korean sources. Sources in English still show higher citation rates than ones in Korean. Other disciplines do not show much difference when translations are categorized separately, except for a slightly higher citation rate for Korean rather than English sources within the field of history.

Country of Origin of Authors and Language of Publication

As shown in Table 25, different author groups show different language preferences, even taking into account their different academic interests (Table 10) and the different language preferences in different disciplines (Table 23).

American and Korean-American authors were the most significant users of sources in English. Europeans and Japanese-Americans cited Korean sources at a much higher rate than did Americans or Korean-Americans. Japanese-Americans cited Korean sources even more than Koreans did (59.3% to 41.2%). On the other hand, Japanese authors cited sources in English, Korean, or Japanese in almost equal proportions. Korean-Americans cited Japanese sources less than did American authors. It is also apparent that Europeans made lesser use of sources in English or Japanese, but relatively high use of sources in Korean or Hancha.

Table 25. Country of Origin of Authors and Language of Publication

	Amer.	Euro.	Jap.	Jap.- Amer.	Kor	Kor. Amer.	Total
English	1,550 49.4%	109 25.3%	42 29.6%	85 22.2%	246 37.6%	965 52.0%	3,375 47.1%
Korean	757 24.1%	167 38.8%	43 30.3%	227 59.3%	270 41.2%	569 30.6%	2,161 30.2%
Japanese	462 14.7%	17 4.0%	47 33.1%	56 14.6%	76 11.6%	199 10.7%	888 12.4%
Hancha	137 4.4%	97 22.6%	2 1.4%	15 3.9%	36 5.5%	48 2.6%	335 4.7%
Chinese	148 4.7%	21 4.9%	4 2.8%		21 3.2%	25 1.3%	220 3.1%
German	40 1.3%	11 2.6%			1 0.2%	17 0.9%	77 1.1%
French	17 0.5%	5 1.2%	1 0.7%		1 0.2%	7 0.4%	34 0.5%
Russian	9 0.3%	2 0.5%	3 2.1%		1 0.2%	4 0.2%	25 0.3%
Kor/Eng	10 0.3%				2 0.3%	3 0.2%	19 0.3%
Han/Kor		1 0.2%			1 0.2%	1 0.1%	3 0.0%
Other	5 0.1%						5 0.1%
Unknown	5 0.2%					19 10.0%	24 0.4%
Total	3,140 100.0%	430 100.0%	142 100.0%	383 100.0%	655 100.0%	1,857 100.0%	7,166 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in Korean studies as a whole.

Disciplines, Country of Origin of Authors, Language of Publication

English sources were cited most by all three groups in economics (Table 45 in Appendix C). Koreans cited English sources even more than did the other two groups. This might reflect conscious choices by Korean authors who publish in American journals to cite sources in the language of the journal. Citation rates to Japanese sources by American and Korean-American authors were elevated by articles on the economic history of the Japanese colonial period. Half of the articles published by those two groups were on that topic, while none of the Korean authors published on that topic.

While all other groups in history cited more Korean sources than English sources, only Americans cited more English sources, as shown in Table 46 in Appendix C. Europeans showed decidedly higher usage of sources in Korean and in Hancha and less use of sources in English and in Japanese. Japanese-American authors were the greatest users of Korean materials and made the least use of English sources. Interestingly, their use of Japanese sources was low compared to other groups. Again, since one author published 4 out of 5 articles in this group, one cannot generalize to all Japanese-American historians writing on Korean history. Korean and Korean-American authors show fairly similar citation behavior in terms of the languages of their sources, even though Korean-Americans used somewhat more sources in English and somewhat fewer sources in Korean than did Korean authors.

Each author group in the field of language shows a very different pattern in their usage of source materials in different languages (Table 47 in Appendix C). Americans made very little use of Korean materials but high use of materials in Japanese, German,

and other languages. Korean authors relied heavily on English language sources.

Evidently, Koreans ignored sources in languages other than English or Korean. Korean-American authors of articles on language resembled American authors in citing materials in various languages, but their use of English and Korean language sources was pretty well balanced.

American or Korean authors in literature exclusively cited sources in either Korean or English, except for one item each in some other language (Table 48 in Appendix C). The difference between the two groups lies in the fact that both cited about two-thirds of all sources in their own native language. In contrast, Korean-Americans used slightly more sources in Korean than in English, but without a large gap between the two. They also cited about 12% of their sources in languages other than Korean or English. Examination of subspecialties did not reveal any particular differences along those lines.

American or Korean-American authors in politics & government, regardless of their ethnic backgrounds, heavily relied on sources in English (equaling or exceeding four-fifths of all sources), as shown in Table 49 in Appendix C. Korean-Americans cited sources in languages other than English or Korean. It is true that one of the articles written by the Korean-American authors was specifically about the Korea-Japan relationship. However, other articles also cited Japanese sources. Given the fact that sources on Korean politics, especially on North Korea, often appear in Japanese, it is surprising to see no citation to Japanese sources by American authors in the field of politics & government.

Place of Publication

Studies have found that, despite some variation from country to country and from discipline to discipline, there is generally a strong tendency for scholars in most countries to refer to publications from their own country, especially in the case of the US and UK. Area studies fields might be expected to show somewhat different patterns and, indeed, American historians writing on modern German history cited sources published in Germany 57.4 percent of the time and U.S. publications 26.4 percent of the time (see chapter 2, "Literature Review").

Table 26 shows the distribution of places of publication cited by authors in Korean studies who published in the four North American journals. Since Korea was divided into North and South in 1948, three different categories are shown in the table: pre-1948 Korea, the Republic of Korea (ROK) for South Korea, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) for North Korea. In contrast, figures for China and Taiwan are lumped together, but without any wish to make a political statement.

Sources published in Korea together account for 43.4% of all sources cited over the 20-year period: 33.7% from South Korea; 6.2% from pre-1948 Korea; and 3.5% from North Korea. Publications from the U.S. account for 32.8%, and those from Japan follow, with 12.7%. Considering that the number of Korean-language sources published in Korea far exceeds the number of English-language sources, while only 29.6% of all sources cited in Korean studies were in Korean, and only 43.4% of sources were published in Korea, it is clear that the Korean studies community publishing in North America greatly prefers sources in English.

Table 26. Place of Publication

	1977-81	1982-86	1987-91	1992-96	Total	Cumulative %
ROK	773 36.5%	453 29.9%	615 39.3%	576 29.3%	2,417 33.7%	33.7%
pre-1948 Korea	112 5.3%	155 10.2%	107 6.8%	71 3.6%	445 6.2%	39.9%
DPRK	123 5.8%	44 2.9%	42 2.7%	40 2.0%	249 3.5%	43.4%
USA	681 32.2%	472 31.2%	481 30.7%	720 36.6%	2,354 32.8%	76.3%
Japan	248 11.7%	219 14.5%	145 9.3%	301 15.3%	913 12.7%	89.0%
China and Taiwan	37 1.8%	67 4.4%	71 4.5%	138 7.1%	313 4.4%	93.4%
UK	33 1.6%	35 2.3%	32 2.0%	58 2.9%	158 2.2%	95.6%
Germany	34 1.6%	16 1.1%	16 1.0%	13 0.7%	79 1.1%	96.7%
Netherlands	15 0.7%	9 0.6%	9 0.6%	4 0.2%	37 0.5%	97.2%
Hong Kong	3 0.1%	1 0.1%	11 0.7%	15 0.8%	30 0.4%	97.6%
USSR	12 0.6%	14 0.9%	1 0.1%	1 0.1%	28 0.4%	98.0%
France	12 0.6%	5 0.3%	4 0.3%	4 0.2%	25 0.3%	98.3%
Finland	10 0.5%	5 0.3%	1 0.1%	1 0.1%	17 0.2%	98.6%
Canada		3 0.2%	1 0.1%	7 0.4%	11 0.2%	98.7%
19 other countries	16 0.7%	10 0.6%	14 0.9%	15 0.8%	55 0.8%	99.5%
Unknown	8 0.4%	6 0.4%	16 1.0%	5 0.3%	35 0.5%	100.0%
Total	2,117 100.0%	1,514 100.0%	1,566 100.0%	1,969 100.0%	7,166 100.0%	

The distribution of most places of publication has fluctuated over the past 20 years. Therefore, it is too early to draw any conclusions from that 20-year period. However, some cases do show steady increases or decreases. For example, the use of publications from pre-1948 Korea and from North Korea declined from period to period, while the use of publications from China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong show steady increases. Citations to publications from the U.K. steadily increased, except during the third period, while citations to publications from all other European countries decreased. Citations to sources from the U.S. decreased until the third period then rose sharply during the fourth period. The latter might be due to high productivity in the field of politics & government during this period. Politics & government shows the highest citation rate to sources published in the U.S., as shown in Table 27.

Disciplines and Place of Publication

Articles on economics and on politics & government mostly cited sources published in the U.S. (Table 27). In contrast, articles on literature and on philosophy & religion relied mostly on sources published in Korea. Interest in the Korean immigrant communities in Japan and in China in the field of anthropology & sociology led to relatively high citation rates to sources published in those countries. Language research cited the lowest percentage of sources from South Korea, but sources from North Korea and Japan played prominent roles. Articles on language also cited sources from the greatest variety of countries. Within the fields of history and philosophy & religion, a close historical and cultural relationship between Korea and China resulted in relatively high citation rates to sources published in China and Taiwan. Also noteworthy were the

Table 27. Disciplines and Place of Publication

	Anth.& Soc.	Econ.	Hist.	Lang.	Lit.	Phil. & Rel.	Pol. & Gov.	Total
ROK	168 20.0%	194 32.5%	1,114 39.2%	96 17.5%	188 47.2%	265 41.8%	270 26.5%	2,417 33.7%
Pre-1948 Korea	24 2.9%	42 7.0%	284 10.0%	9 1.6%	21 5.3%	60 9.5%		445 6.2%
DPRK	2 0.2%	3 0.5%	59 2.1%	69 12.6%	18 4.5%	2 0.3%	96 9.4%	249 3.5%
USA	303 36.1%	272 45.6%	738 25.9%	156 28.5%	132 33.2%	163 25.7%	500 49.0%	2,354 32.8%
Japan	145 17.3%	55 9.2%	433 15.2%	99 18.1%	5 1.3%	68 10.7%	84 8.2%	913 12.7%
China and Taiwan	144 17.1%	4 0.7%	98 3.4%	2 0.4%	4 1.1%	38 6.0%	8 0.8%	313 4.4%
UK	31 3.7%	10 1.7%	49 1.7%	10 1.8%	17 4.3%	16 2.5%	17 1.7%	158 2.2%
Germany	5 0.6%	1 0.2%	17 0.6%	42 7.7%	3 0.8%	2 0.3%	5 0.5%	79 1.1%
Netherlands	4 0.5%	4 0.7%	8 0.3%	10 1.8%	3 0.8%	4 0.6%		37 0.5%
Hong Kong	5 0.6%		5 0.2%		1 0.3%	1 0.2%	16 1.6%	30 0.4%
USSR			7 0.2%	16 2.9%	1 0.3%		4 0.4%	28 0.4%
France	1 0.1%	1 0.2%	5 0.2%	9 1.6%	2 0.5%	3 0.5%	3 0.3%	25 0.3%
Finland				15 2.7%			2 0.2%	17 0.2%
Canada		2 0.3%	3 0.1%	1 0.2%		2 0.3%	3 0.3%	11 0.2%
19 other countries	5 0.6%	6 1.0%	13 0.5%	14 2.7%	1 0.3%	6 0.9%	4 0.4%	55 0.9%
Unknown	3 0.4%	3 0.5%	12 0.4%		2 0.5%	4 0.6%	8 0.8%	35 0.5%
Total	840 100%	597 100%	2,845 100%	548 100%	398 100%	634 100%	1,020 100%	7,166 100%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in Korean studies as a whole.

high rates for North Korean materials in articles on language and on politics & government and for pre-1948 Korean sources in articles on history and on philosophy & religion.

Country of Origin of Authors and Place of Publication

In general, authors preferred sources published in their own countries, with the exception of Europeans and Japanese-Americans (Table 28). In the case of Europeans, there is only a small number of publications on Korea produced on the continent, compared to those produced in the U.S. or Japan. Americans and Europeans do not show much difference in their interest in Korean topics (Table 10). However, Table 28 shows significant differences with respect to the places of publication of their sources. While Europeans cited Korean sources at the rate of 64% and U.S. sources at the rate of 14%, American authors cited both in almost equal proportions. A further difference is that 14.6% of American citations were to sources from Japan, in comparison to only 4.9% for European citations. Closer examination of research subspecialties within these two author groups did not reveal any greater concentration on topics related Japan on the part of either group. It seems safe to conclude that the different citation patterns of these two groups reflect their respective preferences with regard to the place of publication of their sources of information.

Japanese authors cited sources from Japan most (34.5%), followed very closely by sources from Korea (32.4%), and then sources from the U.S. (23.9%). In contrast to both Japanese and American authors, Japanese-Americans cited sources from Korea most (67.3%), then ones from the U.S. (15.9%) and from Japan (13.8%). The respective

Table 28. Country of Origin of Authors and Place of Publication

	Amer.	Euro.	Jap.	Jap.- Amer.	Kor.	Kor.- Amer.	Total
ROK	894 28.5%	233 54.2%	20 14.1%	225 58.7%	321 49.0%	587 31.6%	2,417 33.7%
Pre-1948 Korea	172 5.5%	42 9.8%		33 8.6%	39 6.0%	94 5.1%	445 6.2%
DPRK	50 1.6%	16 3.7%	26 18.3%		13 2.0%	141 7.6%	249 3.5%
USA	1,123 35.8%	60 14.0%	34 23.9%	61 15.9%	151 23.1%	656 35.3%	2,354 32.8%
Japan	460 14.6%	21 4.9%	49 34.5%	53 13.8%	79 12.1%	221 11.9%	913 12.7%
China and Taiwan	205 6.5%	26 6.1%	4 2.8%		29 4.5%	45 2.4%	313 4.4%
UK	75 2.4%	13 3.0%	4 2.8%	8 2.1%	10 1.5%	31 1.7%	158 2.2%
Germany	46 1.5%	9 2.1%			2 0.3%	13 0.7%	79 1.1%
Netherlands	19 0.6%	2 0.5%	1 0.7%	1 0.3%	1 0.2%	9 0.5%	37 0.5%
Hong Kong	15 0.5%			1 0.3%		13 0.7%	30 0.4%
USSR	12 0.4%	1 0.2%	3 2.1%		1 0.2%	4 0.2%	28 0.4%
France	9 0.3%	4 0.9%			1 0.2%	8 0.4%	25 0.3%
Finland	11 0.4%					4 0.2%	17 0.2%
Canada	6 0.2%				1 0.2%	3 0.2%	11 0.2%
Other 19 countries	25 0.7%	1 0.2%	1 0.7%	1 0.3%	4 0.6%	16 1.0%	55 0.8%
Unknown	18 0.6%	2 0.5%			3 0.5%	12 0.6%	35 0.5%
Total	3,140 100.0%	430 100.0%	142 100.0%	383 100.0%	655 100.0%	1,857 100.0%	7,166 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in Korean studies as a whole.

citation ratios to sources from Korea and from the U.S. by Koreans and Korean-American authors were 57% : 23.1% and 44.3% : 35.3%. Although this ratio can be interpreted as reflecting author preferences for publications from the country in which they live, it is hard to make the same case for Japanese-Americans. It could be that the combination of different citation patterns reflects differing subject matters as well as different author group preferences.

Disciplines, Country of Origin of Authors, and Place of Publication

American and Korean authors in economics cited more sources published in Korea than sources from the U.S. or any other country, while Korean-American authors cited more sources from the U.S. than from any other country, including Korea (Table 50 in Appendix D). Korean authors, who published no articles on economic history, did not cite sources from pre-1948 Korea or from Japan (with one exception). In contrast, both American and Korean-American authors cited sources (ranging from 11.4% to 21.3%) from Japan, as half of each of their articles were on the economic history of the colonial period. While Americans relied relatively more on sources from Japan, Korean-Americans relied less on Japanese sources and more on sources from the U.S.

Regardless of author's country of origin, all author groups within history cited more sources from Korea than from elsewhere, as shown in Table 51 in Appendix D. However, the citation rate of American authors to sources published in the U.S. (35.0%) was about the same as to sources from Korea (38.6%), while other author groups cited sources from Korea at far more than double the rate they cited sources from the U.S. The low citation rate to sources from Japan by both European and Japanese-American

historians is noteworthy. Another noticeably low rate is to sources from the U.S. by European, Japanese-American, and Korean historians, compared to Americans or Korean-Americans.

American authors in the field of language relied least on sources from Korea or from the U.S., but their reliance on sources from Japan, Germany, and other European countries was higher than it was for Korean or Korean-American authors (Table 52 in Appendix D). Korean authors cited very heavily (60.7%) sources published in America and they hardly cited sources from countries other than the U.S. or Korea. Korean-Americans show citation patterns similar to those of Americans, except that they relied more on sources from Korea or America than on sources from any other countries.

All three author groups in the field of literature cited Korean sources more than sources from any other country. However, the proportions of sources from Korea or from the U.S. cited by different groups show some differences. Korean authors cited sources from Korea for more than 80% of all the sources they cited. Accordingly, their citation rate to sources from other countries, including the U.S., were significantly lower than for other author groups (Table 53 in Appendix D). Americans were the greatest users of sources from the U.S. (43.2%), followed by Korean-Americans (31.7%). Koreans cited U.S. sources at a rate less than half (14.3%) that of the other two groups.

American and Korean-American authors in politics & government show very similar patterns in the ratios at which they cited sources published in the U.S. and in Korea (Table 54 in Appendix D). One article by an American author made all but one citation to North Korean sources, far off the mark for American citation patterns in

politics & government. Korean-American made significantly greater use of sources from Japan than did Americans.

Subject of Publication

The subject distribution of references measures the degree of interdisciplinary research and of subject self-citation within a field. Studies have shown that the subject distribution of citing documents in studies of ethnic groups does not always match that of the cited documents (see chapter 2 "Literature Review").

The Library of Congress (LC) Classification was used for this study. The following classification is from the *LC Classification Outline*, 6th edition.

A	General Works
B	Philosophy. Psychology. Religion
C	Auxiliary Sciences of History
D	History: General and Old World
E - F	History: America (Western Hemisphere)
G	Geography. Maps. Anthropology. Recreation
H-HJ	Social Sciences: Economics
HM-HX	Social Sciences: Sociology
J	Political Science
K	Law
L	Education
M	Music and Books on Music
N	Fine Arts
P	Language and Literature
Q	Science
R	Medicine
S	Agriculture
T	Technology
U	Military Science
V	Naval Science
Z	Bibliography. Library Science

Table 29. Subject of Publication

	1977-81	1982-86	1987-91	1992-96	Total
A	186	131	156	396	869
	8.8%	8.7%	10.0%	20.1%	12.1%
B	90	161	109	136	496
	4.3%	10.6%	7.0%	6.9%	6.9%
C	18	27	20	11	76
	0.9%	1.8%	1.3%	0.6%	1.1%
D	857	688	590	659	2,794
	40.5%	45.4%	37.7%	33.5%	39.0%
E-F	30	19	3	38	90
	1.4%	1.3%	0.2%	1.9%	1.3%
G	40	26	30	29	125
	1.9%	1.7%	1.9%	1.5%	1.7%
H-HJ	130	90	297	144	661
	6.1%	6.0%	19.0%	7.3%	9.3%
HM-HX	91	63	66	129	349
	4.3%	4.2%	4.2%	6.6%	4.9%
J	156	50	50	93	349
	7.4%	3.3%	3.2%	4.7%	4.9%
K	30	6	23	8	67
	1.4%	0.4%	1.5%	0.4%	0.9%
L	4	11	22	13	50
	0.2%	0.7%	1.4%	0.7%	0.7%
M	6	5	1	13	25
	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%	0.7%	0.3%
N	3	5	11	13	32
	0.1%	0.3%	0.7%	0.7%	0.4%
P (Language)	258	111	36	50	455
	12.1%	7.3%	2.4%	2.5%	6.5%
P (Literature)	145	58	62	143	408
	6.9%	3.9%	3.9%	7.3%	5.5%
Q; T	3	13	5	3	24
	0.1%	0.9%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%
R	2	2	14	8	26
	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%	0.4%	0.4%
S		7	6	3	16
		0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%
U; V	4	2	2	8	16
	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.5%	0.2%
Z	7	8	4	2	21
	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%
Misc.	57	31	59	70	217
	2.7%	2.1%	3.8%	3.6%	3.0%
Total	2,117	1,514	1,566	1,969	7,166
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

It is important to note that the subject matter of a book or a journal is not always clearly assignable to just one classification. An item can be classified under two, three, or sometimes more subjects. The author has noticed that many such vague items are classified under DS (history of Asia). For example, the four journals chosen for this study were all classified under DS, even though the contents of the articles published in the journals represent all areas in Korean or Asian studies. It should also be noted that selections and collections of classic literary works by one author are often classified under AC (Collections. Series. Collected works) or P (Literature).

This study confirms the findings of other studies, namely, that the subject distribution of citing documents does not match that of the cited documents (Table 29). Sources in all subjects except history were cited in smaller proportions than the subjects of the citing documents might lead one to expect. History (41.4%) was the most cited subject in Korean studies, followed by general materials (12.1%), such as newspapers and general periodicals, and economics (9.3%), while history (33.7%), literature (11.9%), and politics & government (11.9%) were the most studied subjects, as shown in Table 4.

Disciplines and Subject of Publication

Table 30 shows the disciplines and the subject distribution of references made within each of them. Sources on history were cited most by other disciplines. The field of language shows the highest subject self-citation rate (70.5%), followed by history (63.7%), and then economics (61.5%). History works cited sources in the greatest variety of subjects. Anthropology & sociology and politics & government, which show the most interdisciplinary citation patterns, cited more sources on history than within their own

Table 30. Disciplines and Subject of Publication

	Anth. & Soc.	Econ.	Hist.	Lang.	Lit.	Phil. & Rel.	Pol. & Gov.	Total
A	177 21.1%	22 3.7%	302 10.6%	25 4.6%	38 9.5%	37 5.8%	252 24.7%	869 12.1%
B	43 5.1%	5 .8%	134 4.7%	10 1.8%	17 4.3%	238 37.5%	10 1.0%	496 6.9%
C	2 0.2%	1 0.2%	66 2.3%	1 0.2%	1 0.3%	3 0.5%	2 0.2%	76 1.1%
D	211 25.1%	96 16.1%	1,704 59.9%	76 13.9%	83 20.9%	244 38.5%	302 29.6%	2,794 39.0%
E-F	16 1.9%	3 0.5%	42 1.5%		1 0.3%		27 2.6%	90 1.3%
G	50 6.0%	2 0.3%	51 1.8%	9 1.6%	1 0.3%	1 0.2%	2 0.2%	125 1.7%
H-HJ	116 13.8%	367 61.5%	89 3.1%		1 0.3%	12 2.0%	58 4.9%	661 9.3%
HM-HX	116 13.8%	35 5.9%	67 2.4%	5 0.9%	9 2.3%	20 3.2%	94 9.2%	349 4.9%
J	10 1.2%	36 6.0%	110 3.9%		6 1.5%	11 1.7%	171 16.8%	349 4.9%
K	4 0.5%		21 0.7%			7 1.1%	34 3.3%	67 .9%
L	12 1.4%	1 0.2%	9 0.3%	2 0.4%		2 0.3%	8 0.8%	50 0.7%
M			2 0.1%		2 0.5%			25 0.3%
N	1 0.1%		16 0.6%	1 0.2%	1 0.3%	13 2.1%		32 0.4%
P (Lang.)	8 0.9%		16 0.4%	387 70.5%	30 7.6%	5 0.9%	2 0.2%	455 6.5%
P (Lit.)	29 3.4%		102 3.6%	20 3.7%	200 50.2%	28 4.4%	1 0.1%	408 5.6%
Q; T		1 0.2%	3 0.1%	7 10.3%			1 0.1%	24 0.3%
R	1 0.1%		1 0.0%	2 0.4%		5 0.8%	3 0.3%	26 0.4%
S		3 0.5%	7 0.2%					16 0.2%
U; V	1 0.1%		7 0.2%				8 0.8%	16 0.2%
Z	1 0.1%		12 0.4%	1 0.2%	2 0.5%	5 0.8%		21 0.3%
Misc.	42 5.0%	25 4.2%	84 2.9%	2 0.4%	6 1.6%	3 0.5%	45 4.4%	217 3.0%
Total	840 100.0%	597 100.0%	2,845 100.0%	548 100.0%	398 100.0%	634 100.0%	1,020 100.0%	7,166 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in Korean studies as a whole.

domains. Among all disciplines, they also cited general materials such as newspapers and general periodicals the most (21.7% and 24.7% respectively). Their citation rates to those general materials were more than to their own fields. Works on philosophy & religion cited sources in history and in their own fields in almost equal proportions. Citations to literature by other disciplines were mainly to selections or collections of literary works.

Disciplines, Country of Origin of Authors, and Subject of Publication

All three author groups in economics show similar citation patterns with respect to subject distribution of references (Table 55 in Appendix E). They all cited sources within their own discipline, and the other disciplines cited most were history, sociology, and politics & government. It should be noted that the greater number of citations to sources on history by American and Korean-American economists was due to articles on economic history, a topic about which Korean authors did not write. Likewise, the high rate at which Korean-American authors cited 'misc' items was skewed by an article on economic history that cited many interviews.

As shown in Table 56 in Appendix E, Japanese-American historians had the highest subject self-citation rate of any author group (78.8%), followed by Koreans (73.0%). However, one must keep in mind that 4 out of 5 articles were written by the same Japanese-American author. Europeans had the lowest subject self-citation rate. Instead, their citation rates to general works or to philosophy & religion were the highest among all author groups. American and Korean-American historians used a greater variety of other subjects in their research.

Among author groups, Korean-Americans in the field of language had the highest subject self-citation rate (76.1%), as shown in Table 57 in Appendix E. As some of their articles were historical studies, Americans and Korean-Americans cited many sources in history. One Korean author who studied the 'expression of emotion' cited all of the sources in psychology, and one Korean-American author cited most of the general works.

In literature, Koreans had the highest subject self-citation rate, making 71.4% of all their references to sources within the field (Table 58 in Appendix E). The rest of their citations were to general works, and only very few (9.5%) were to arts and language. They did not cite any other subjects, including history, which was the second most cited subject by the other two author groups. Americans and Korean-Americans show pretty much the same subject citation pattern.

History was the most cited subject by authors in politics & government (Table 59 in Appendix E). Korean-Americans show a high citation rate (29.5%) to general works (mostly newspapers) and a low rate (13.8%) to their own field. In contrast, Americans cited general works (14.5%) at only about half of the rate that Korean-Americans did, but made their own field the second most cited subject area. Their citation rates to economics, sociology, or law were higher than that of Korean-Americans.

CHAPTER 7

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LITERATURE CITED III:

CORE AUTHORS AND SOURCES

The most frequently cited authors, individual works, monographs, and journal titles were examined to identify the most significant authors, monographs, journals, and newspapers in Korean studies. They are identified for Korean studies as a whole and for each disciplinary component of Korean studies. To identify disciplines with more core or diverse authors, the percentage of authors who received 10, 25, and 50% of all citations in each discipline was examined.

Most Frequently Cited Authors

Table 31 shows the authors who were cited 15 or more times in Korean studies over the 20-year period. Some authors cannot be classified under any areas of expertise, since they are authors or originators of primary sources. Examples include the Ch'unch'ugwan, a government institution that recorded the annals of Korea's Yi Dynasty, and the various agencies of the Chosen Sotokufu, the Japanese colonial government in Korea from 1910 to 1945. (The various arms of the Chosen Sotokufu are treated here as one author.)

Author self-citation frequencies shown in parentheses. Author self-citation rates in this study are calculated as the ratio of an author's self citations to the total citations

Table 31. Most Frequently Cited Authors

Author	Freq.	%	Cumulative %	Area of Expertise
Ch'unch'ugwan (Yi Dynasty)	75	1.0	1.0	
Han, U-gun	42	0.6	1.6	history
Yi, Ki-baek	41	0.6	2.2	history
Yi, Kwang-nin	37 (5)	0.5	2.7	history
Chosen Sotokufu	36	0.5	3.2	
Palais, James B.	31 (6)	0.4	3.7	hist.; phil.
Cumings, Bruce	29 (5)	0.4	4.1	hist.; pol.
Miller, Roy Andrew	29 (19)	0.4	4.5	language
Wagner, Edward W.	28	0.4	4.9	history
Lee, Chong-sik	26.5	0.4	5.3	politics
Sin, Yong-ha	25.5	0.4	5.7	history
Hatada, Takashi	22	0.3	6.0	history
Suh, Dae-sook	20.5 (3)	0.3	6.3	politics
Ch'on, Kwan-u	20	0.3	6.6	history
Deuchler, Martina	20 (2)	0.3	6.8	hist.; phil.
Fukaya, Toshikane	20	0.3	7.1	history
Kim, Il-song	20	0.3	7.4	
Kim, Yong-sop	19	0.3	7.7	history
Korean Central News Agency, DPRK	19	0.3	7.9	
Sudo, Yoshiyuki	19	0.3	8.2	history
Yi, Sang-baek	18.5	0.3	8.5	history
Lew, Young I.	18 (13)	0.3	8.8	history
Han, Yong-u	17	0.2	9.0	history
Iryon (1206-1289)	17	0.2	9.3	
Kuksa P'yonch'an Wiwonhoe	17	0.2	9.5	history
Ramstedt, Gustaf J.	17	0.2	9.8	language
Martin, Samuel E.	16.5	0.2	10.0	language
Yi, Ki-mun	16	0.2	10.3	language
Yi, U-song	16	0.2	10.5	hist.; phil.
Murayama, Shichiro	15.5	0.2	10.7	language
Kang, Chin-ch'ol	15	0.2	10.9	history
Pyon, T'ae-sop	15	0.2	11.1	history
Robinson, Michael E.	15 (6)	0.2	11.3	history
Yi, Son-gun	15	0.2	11.5	history
Yun, Chi-ho	15	0.2	11.7	

Note. Numbers in parentheses represent author self-citation frequencies.

he/she received in all the articles of the four journals chosen for this study. The highest self-citation rates were by Lew Young I. (at 72.2%) and Roy Andrew Miller (at 65.5%).

Since history has been the most studied subject in Korean studies for the past 20 years, historians mostly rank at the top. Among 30 authors of secondary sources, 22 did not contribute any articles in the four journals chosen for this study.

A total of 4,160 individuals or coauthors produced 7,166 cited works. The 27 most highly cited authors, at 0.65% of the total, are responsible for 10% of the total number of cited works. Of the total, 3.6% (148 out of 4,160) accounted for 25.0% of the total number of works cited, while 755 authors, or 18% of the total, are responsible for 50% of all works cited.

Table 60 in Appendix F shows authors who were cited at least 3.5 or more times in the field of anthropology & sociology. The top-ranking corporate author, Korean Council for Women Drafted by Japan, was cited 7 times in one article. Yun Chung-ok was cited 4.25 times also by the same article. Thus, although they are included in the list of most frequently cited authors, their works were not sought by a variety of authors. In addition to authors in anthropology & sociology, authors from fields such as history, philosophy & religion, economics, and politics are also listed in the table, indicating the extent of interdisciplinary approaches taken by authors in anthropology & sociology. Three percent (21) of the most highly cited authors account for 10% of the total number of citations, while 11.5% of the total number of authors are responsible for 25% of the total number of citations, and 41.8% of the authors accounted for 50% of the citations.

Table 61 in Appendix F shows authors who were cited four or more times in the field of economics. Although Kada Naoji ranks at the top, all of the 13 citations he received came from a single article. Since many articles were on economic history, the list shows many historians or authors of historical sources such as Chosen Sotokufu, Bruce Cumings, and James B. Palais. Eight (1.9%) of the most highly cited authors account for 10% of the total number of citations, while 7.5% of the total number of authors are responsible for 25% of the total number of citations, and 30% of the authors account for 49.9% of the citations.

Table 62 in Appendix F shows authors who were cited 12 or more times in the field of history. As this field produced the most articles and the most citations in Korean studies, the number of citations received by each author is much larger than in other fields. Once again, the high self-citation rate (72.2%) of Lew Young I. is noteworthy. As the field shows a high subject self-citation rate (see Table 30, 'Subject of Publication'), the most highly cited authors in history are all historians. Thirteen (0.8%) of the most highly cited authors account for 10.2% of the total number of citations, while 3.7% of the total number of authors are responsible for 25.1% of the total number of citations, and 17.8% of the authors account for 50% of the citations.

As shown in Table 63 in Appendix F, Miller Roy Andrew was the most cited author in the field of language. However, 19 (70.4%) of the 27 citations he received were self-citations. All authors cited 6 or more times in the field of language are authors in the same field, yielding no evidence of interdisciplinary approaches. The three most highly cited authors, or 1% of the total, are responsible for 10.8% of the total number of

citations, while a mere 3.8% of the total number of authors are responsible for 25% of the total number of citations, and 16.2% of the authors account for 49.9% of the citations.

Table 64 in Appendix F shows authors who were cited four or more times in the field of literature. To differentiate primary from the secondary authors, authors of literary works are listed as 'writers' in the column under 'area of expertise'. Many writers were cited only in the articles dealing with their works or themselves. Although David R. McCann ranked second, 12.5 (92.6%) out of 13.5 citations he received were self-citations. The three most highly cited authors (or 1% of the total) account for 9.8% of the total number of citations, while 6.2% of the total number of authors are responsible for 25.2% of the total number of citations, and 29.9% of the authors account for 50% of the citations.

Table 65 in Appendix F shows authors who were cited five or more times in the field of philosophy & religion. In this field, James B. Palais shows a high self-citation rate of 67%, while his self-citation rate in history is only 17% (see Table 62 in Appendix F). Historians or authors of historical sources were highly cited in the field of philosophy & religion, since most of the articles are on Confucianism during the Yi Dynasty and works on Confucianism are often classified under either history (of philosophy) or philosophy. The eight most highly cited authors (1.8% of the total) accounted for 10.6% of the total number of citations, while 7.3% of the total number of authors are responsible for 25.1% of the total number of citations, and 30.2% accounted for 50% of the citations.

Table 66 in Appendix F shows authors who were cited 6 or more times in the field of politics & government. The first, third, and twelfth most frequently cited authors are

North Koreans. News service agencies such as the Korean Central News Agency of North Korea and the U.S. Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) were frequently cited. Citations to authors of works on historical or sociological aspects of politics ranked high, along with authors within the field of politics & government itself. The eight most highly cited authors (1.1% of the total) account for 9.9% of the total number of citations, while 5.3% of the total number of authors are responsible for 25.1% of the total number of citations, and 31.9% account for 50% of the citations.

As examined above, the fields of history and language (in which 16.2% to 17.8% of the total cited authors are responsible for 50% of all cited works) show more prestigious author groups than others, while anthropology & sociology show the most scattered dispersion of authors (41.8% of the total number of cited authors are responsible for 50% of all cited works). Not many secondary authors are highly cited across disciplines. Only three authors (James B. Palais, Bruce Cumings, and Lee Chong-sik) were included among those most frequently cited in three disciplines, and nine authors (Han U-gun, Yi Ki-baek, Yi Kwang-nin, Edward W. Wagner, Sin Yong-ha, Martina Deuchler, Fukaya Toshikane, Sudo Yoshiyuki, Yi Sang-baek) were included among those most frequently cited in two disciplines.

Most Frequently Cited Sources

Title dispersion was examined in order to identify any core literature (classical works or core journals) in Korean studies. The total of 7,166 citations in 198 articles in the four journals breaks down into 2,899 monograph titles, 665 serial titles, 123 doctoral or master's theses, 161 unpublished titles, and 84 titles in all other categories. In addition

to the total number of citations a source received, the number of citing articles of a source (shown in 'No. Citing' column) was also examined to identify how widely each source was cited.

The most frequently cited titles account for only 1-1.3% of the total citations in each respective category, as shown in Tables 64, 65, and 66. This indicates that research in Korean studies relies on a diversity of sources, rather than on a core literature, as is often the case in the sciences. Table 32 lists monographic titles cited 10 or more times. Seven of the 17 are primary sources. Nine out of 17 are multivolume collections. For example, *Choson wangjo sillok* is a multivolume collection of the annals of Korea's Yi Dynasty (1392-1910), and *Taisho shinshu daizokyo* and *Tripitaka Koreanum* are collections of Buddhist scripture. The three titles, *Han'guksa* (Chindan Hakhoe), *Han'guksa* (Kuksa P'yonch'an Wiwonhoe) and *Han'guk munhwasa taegye*, are multivolume sets of Korean history or cultural history covering over 2,000 years. They were published in the 1960 or 1970s and are considered classics in the field of history. The only independent monographic secondary sources listed are *Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895-1945*; *Politics and Policy in Traditional Korea*; *Politics of Korean Nationalism*; *Origins of the Korean War, vol. 1*; *Korea, the Politics of the Vortex*; and *Literati Purges: Political Conflict in Early Yi Korea*.

It is noteworthy that while all the primary sources or multivolume collections on the list were published in Korea, all of the independent volumes were published in the U.S. It is very surprising to find that none of the many individual volume works published in Korea were on the list, despite the thousands published every year.

Table 32. Most Frequently Cited Monographs

Title	No. Citing	Freq.	%	Subject Class.	Format
Choson Wangjo Sillok	18	69	1.0	D	P, C
Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo	4	30	0.4	B	P, C
Han'guksa, Chindan Hakhoe	15	20	0.3	D	C
Han'guksa, Kuksa Pyonchan Wiwonhoe	11	17	0.2	D	C
Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895- 1945	11	16	0.2	J	C
Koryosa	14	14	0.2	D	P, C
Politics and Policy in Traditional Korea	13	13	0.2	J	M
Samguk Sagi	11	12	0.2	D	P
Politics of Korean Nationalism	12	12	0.2	D	M
Yun Ch'i-Ho Ilgi	11	12	0.2	D	P, C
Han'guk Munhwasa Taegye	8	12	0.2	D	C
Origins of the Korean War, vol. 1	12	11	0.2	D	M
Korea, the Politics of the Vortex	11	11	0.2	D	M
Samguk Yusa	9	10	0.1	D	P
Tanjae Sin Ch'aeho Chonjip	9	10	0.1	D	C
Tripitaka Koreanum	2	10	0.1	B	P, C
Literati Purges: Political Conflict in Early Yi Korea	10	10	0.1	D	M

Note. In the 'format' column, 'P' denotes 'primary source', 'C' denotes 'collection of works' by an author or an 'edited volume' of works by several authors, and 'M' denotes 'individual monograph' by an author or co-authors.

The fact that the materials listed in the table are mostly classified under history results from the fact that history was the subject most studied and hence accounts for the greatest number of citations received.

Table 33 shows journals cited 10 or more times. Unlike monographic literature, the most frequently cited journals broadly include titles published in both Korea and the

Table 33. Most Frequently Cited Journals

Title	No. Citing	Freq.	%	Subject Class.
Yoksa Hakpo, ROK	25	92	1.3	D
Korea Journal, ROK	31	70	1.0	D
Chosen Gakuho, Japan	21	46	0.6	D
Journal of Korean Studies, USA	24	38	0.5	D
Sahak Yon'gu, ROK	11	33	0.5	D
Han'guksa Yon'gu, ROK	16	31	0.4	D
Occasional Papers on Korea, USA	16	30	0.4	D
Asian Survey, USA	17	30	0.4	D
Chindan Hakpo, ROK	16	29	0.4	D
Shigaku Zasshi, Japan	11	28	0.4	D
Choson Omun, DPRK	2	26	0.4	P
Rekishigaku Kenkyu, Japan	10	22	0.3	D
Language, USA	9	21	0.3	P
Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, ROK	15	21	0.3	H
Far Eastern Economic Review, Hong Kong	7	20	0.3	HC
Journal of Asian Studies, USA	12	19	0.3	D
Korean Repository, Korea	7	19	0.3	D
Yoksa Kwahak, DPRK	4	19	0.3	D
Sin Tonga, ROK	10	18	0.3	AP
Asea Yon'gu, ROK	15	18	0.3	D
Sasanggye, ROK	8	17	0.2	AP
Korean Studies, USA	13	16	0.2	D
Tongbang Hakchi, ROK	12	14	0.2	D
Keizai Geppo, Japan	1	14	0.2	HC
Department of State Bulletin, USA	6	13	0.2	J
Korea Newsreview, ROK	3	13	0.2	D
Kaebok, Korea	5	12	0.2	AP
Han'guk Saron, ROK	8	12	0.2	D
Seikyu Gakuso, Japan	8	12	0.2	D
Time, USA	3	12	0.2	AP
FBIS, USA	3	12	0.2	D
Han'guk Hakpo, ROK	7	12	0.2	D
Choson Ohak, DPRK	1	12	0.2	P
Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, USA	9	11	0.2	D
Ural-Altaische Jahrbucher, Germany	5	11	0.2	D
Paeksan Hakpo, ROK	10	11	0.2	D
Sach'ong, ROK	7	10	0.1	D
Chosenshi Kenkyukai Rombunshu, Japan	6	10	0.1	D
American Sociological Review, USA	7	10	0.1	HM
World Politics, USA	8	10	.1	D

U.S. The inclusion of relatively many Japanese journals is also noteworthy. It can be concluded that international communication among scholars in Korean studies is accomplished through articles published in journals, not through monographs. The only two periodicals from countries other than the Koreas, the USA, or Japan are the *Far Eastern Economic Review* from Hong Kong and *Ural-Altaische Jahrbucher* from Germany.

Even though 40 periodicals are cited 10 or more times, only a few titles are cited by more than 10 different articles. Only 18 of the 40 periodicals are cited in 10 or more articles. *Keizai Geppo* (Japan) and *Choson Ohak* (DPRK) are each cited by only one article, and 25 out of 26 citations to *Choson Omun* (DPRK) occur within a single article. *Time* magazine and works by the Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) are each cited by only three articles.

Most of the top-ranked periodicals are classified under D, history. This again results from the fact that 'history' was the most studied subject. However, it should also be noted that Korean studies journals are also currently catalogued under D (history), even though they cover many subjects other than history.

The *New York Times* was the most frequently cited newspaper in Korean studies over the 20-year period, as shown in Table 34. Since each newspaper article was separately counted, a small number of citing articles is often responsible for a large number of citations to each newspaper. Only three of the 17 newspapers that were cited 11 or more times were cited in 10 or more articles. Even though it was cited 71 times, the *New York Times* was cited in only 8 articles. Each of the four Chinese newspapers was

not only cited in just one article; all were cited by the same article, which concerned the Korean community in China. Similarly, 30 of the 42 citations received by *Tongnip Sinmun* and 22 of the 27 citations received by the *Independent* were from a single article, and 17 of the 21 citations of the *Japan Times* and 8 of the 12 citations of *Hwangsong Sinmun* were from one article each.

Table 34. Most Frequently Cited Newspapers

Title	No. Citing	Freq.	%
New York Times, USA	8	73	1.0
Tonga Ilbo, ROK	14	51	0.7
Tongnip Sinmun, Korea	7	42	0.6
Korea Herald, ROK	10	41	0.6
Asahi Shinbun, Japan	10	37	0.5
Nodong Sinmun, DPRK	5	35	0.5
Korea Times, ROK	9	30	0.4
Independent, Korea	5	27	0.4
Choson Ilbo, ROK	7	23	0.3
Japan Times, Japan	4	21	0.3
Hungnyonggang Ilbo, China	1	19	0.3
Hungnyonggang Sinmun, China	1	19	0.3
Jilin Ribao, China	1	16	0.2
Chungang Ilbo, ROK	4	13	0.2
Hwangsong Sinmun, Korea	3	12	0.2
Japan Weekly Mail, Japan	1	11	0.2
Jen Min Jih Pao, China	4	11	0.2

The total of 840 citations within the 21 articles in the field of anthropology & sociology cite 388 monographic titles, 122 serial titles, 26 unpublished titles, 20 dissertations or theses, and 30 other works. The average citation to each unique title was

1.43, while 499 citations (59.4% of the total) were to unique titles. Table 67 in Appendix G shows 24 titles that were cited 4 or more times in anthropology & sociology. While there were 21 source articles in the field, the number of citing articles ranges only from 1 to 4, indicating a lack of core literature or classical works in the field. Even though many newspapers ranked high in the field of anthropology & sociology (with 14 of 24 [58.3%] of the total titles listed in the table), 8 were cited only in one article and 3 were cited in no more than two. *Korea Journal* and *Asian Survey* appear to be prestigious journals in the field of anthropology & sociology.

The 597 citations in the 17 source articles in economics were to 473 unique titles: 318 monographic titles, 103 serial titles, 21 dissertations or theses, 20 unpublished titles, and 11 others. The average citation to each unique title was 1.26, with 411 citations (68.8%) to unique titles, indicating very highly scattered dispersion of cited titles in economics. Table 68 in Appendix G lists 10 titles that were cited 4 or more times by 17 source articles in economics. The *Economic Development and Cultural Change* is identified as a prestigious journal in the field of economics. *Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895-1945* and *Origins of the Korean War, Vol. 1* appear to be classic titles for research in Korean economic history.

The 2,845 citations in the 65 source articles in history were to 1,527 unique titles: 1,132 monographs, 273 serials, 60 unpublished materials, 42 dissertations or theses, and 14 others. The average citation to each unique title was 1.86, with 1,138 citations (40% of the total) to unique titles. Table 69 in Appendix G lists titles cited 16 or more times. Nine out of 16 (56.3%) were cited by 10 or more source articles. Some newspapers rank high,

but each of them were cited by only a few source articles. The cited titles are almost exclusively classified under D (history). *Yoksa Hakpo*, *Chosen Gakuho*, *Korea Journal*, *Han'guksa Yon'gu*, and the *Journal of Korean Studies* appear to be prestigious journals in the field of history.

The 548 citations in the 18 articles in the field of language were to 344 unique titles: 222 monographs, 98 serials, 18 dissertations to theses, and 6 unpublished titles. The average citation to a unique title was 1.59, while 260 citations (47.45%) were to unique titles. Table 70 in Appendix G lists 19 titles cited 4 or more times. Although they ranked high, *Choson Omun* and *Choson Ohak* were cited by only 1 or 2 articles. The journals *Language*, *Ural-Altaische Jahrbucher*, and *Asea yon'gu* and the monographs *Studies in Korean Etymology* and *Kaejong kugosa kaesol* are identified as prestigious titles in the field of language.

The 398 citations in the 23 source articles in literature were to 328 unique titles: 268 monographs, 44 serials, 9 unpublished titles, 3 dissertations or theses, and 4 others. The average citation to a unique title was 1.21. Table 71 in Appendix G lists 14 titles cited 3 or more times. No core literature can be identified. Only one title was cited more than 5 times. Even *Sasanggye*, cited 7 times, was cited by only one article. *Han'guk Munhak T'ongsa* can be considered as a prestigious title in literature. *Korean Women: View from the Inner Room* was cited three times by three different articles, but two of them were an author's self-citation to his own article in the collection. Also of note is that some collections of literary works were included as frequently cited titles.

The 634 citations in 13 source articles in the field of philosophy & religion were to 466 unique titles: 370 monographs, 68 serials, 15 dissertations or theses, 11 unpublished titles, and 2 others. The average number of citations to each unique title was 1.36, while 397 citations (62.6% of the total) were to unique titles. As shown in Table 72 in Appendix G, no core literature can be identified in philosophy & religion. *Literati Purges: Political Conflict in Early Yi Korea* and *Confucianism in Action* can be considered prestigious works in the field.

The 1,020 citations in 23 source articles in the field of politics & government were to 573 unique titles: 374 monographs, 147 serials, 26 unpublished titles, 11 dissertations or theses, and 15 others. The average number of citations received by each unique title was 1.78, with 474 (46.5%) of 1,020 citations to unique titles. Table 73 in Appendix G lists 27 titles that were cited 5 or more times. Eleven out of 27 (or 40.7% of the total) were newspapers, but each of them was cited by only a few source articles. *Asian Survey*, *Korea Observer*, and *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies* can be considered prestigious journals and *Korean Communist Movement, 1918-1948*, *Communism in Korea*, and *Political Leadership in Korea* can be considered prestigious monographic works in politics & government.

As discussed above, the *Choson Wangjo Sillok* appears to be an important primary source in studies of various aspects of Korea's Yi Dynasty. No secondary monographic literature was identified as among the classic or most prestigious titles in Korean studies as a whole. Although some monographs were identified as prestigious in each discipline, none received a significant number of citations by a variety of articles. In

addition to the prestigious journals identified in each discipline, a few journal titles appear to be important in several disciplines in Korean studies. To wit: *Korea Journal* was highly cited in five disciplines: anthropology & sociology, history, literature, philosophy & religion, and politics & government; the *Journal of Korean Studies*, *Occasional Papers on Korea* (a ceased title), and *Asian Survey* were cited frequently in three disciplines; and *Yoksa Hakpo*, *Shigaku Zasshi*, *Far Eastern Economic Review*, *Journal of Asian Studies*, *Korean Repository* (a ceased title), *Sin Tonga*, *Korea Newsreview*, and *World Politics* received relatively frequent citations in two disciplines.

CHAPTER 8

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of the Study

This study was undertaken in order to describe and explore the historical picture of research interests and formal communication patterns in the Korean studies field in North America by analyzing its literature. It was anticipated that this study would enable information scientists to expand their knowledge of scholarly communication in the field of area studies, especially an area that has quite a different historical and cultural background (including a non-Latin writing system) from that of the researchers who study the area. This study also aimed to promote the future development of Korean studies and provide information specialists and librarians with practical aids for bibliographic control and for such library services as collection development and maintenance for the Korean studies field.

In order to characterize the field of Korean studies in North America, its representative literature was identified as articles in Korean studies and Asian studies journals between 1977 and 1996. The journals included in this study were *Korean Studies (KS)*, the *Journal of Korean Studies (JKS)*, the *Journal of Asian Studies (JAS)*, and the *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies (HJAS)*. Subject matters and author characteristics of the source articles were examined, along with various characteristics such as the form, date, language, country of origin, subject, key authors, and key titles of the literature cited

in the source articles. In order to trace trends in the growth and development of Korean studies over time, this study grouped the data into five-year periods: 1977-1981, 1982-1986, 1987-1991, and 1992-1996. The four journals produced 193 source articles, which provided 7,166 references over the 20-year period.

Research in Korean studies falls within fourteen broad disciplines. Seven disciplines comprise 93.3% of all articles. History was the most studied discipline, accounting for 33.7% of all the source articles, followed by literature (11.9%) and politics & government (11.9%). While the number of articles in history and language have been declining since their peak period during 1982-1986, research on literature and on politics & government has shown rapid acceleration after a slowdown during 1982-1986. It is difficult to perceive trends in anthropology & sociology, in economics, and in philosophy & religion, since they have fluctuated over the 20-year period.

Altogether, 150 authors published 193 articles, without yielding any prolific author group. More and more authors became interested in Korean studies during the third and the fourth periods. Americans, who published 39.9% of the 193 articles, have been the most active authors in Korean studies, followed closely by authors of Korean ethnicity (38.8%). While contributions by Americans have been gradually declining since the end of the second period (1982-1986), the Korean ethnic group's contribution has been rising since the fourth period. Generally, all author groups have had greater interest in history. While non-Koreans have placed great emphasis in history, followed by anthropology & sociology and philosophy & religion; Korean authors show interest in

language, literature, and economics; and Korean-American authors show interest in politics & government, literature, and language.

The 150 authors in this study were affiliated with 97 different institutions. Authors at the University of Hawaii (UH) have published the most articles in the four journals, followed by those at the University of Washington (UW). However, authors tend to prefer their own institution's affiliated journal: authors at UH publishing in *Korean Studies* and authors at UW publishing in the *Journal of Korean Studies*. The two most productive institutions both yielded a much larger number of articles in history than in any other disciplines. However, they differ in other respects. While authors at UH have had more interest in economics and politics & government than those at UW, the latter have shown more interest in philosophy & religion than the former.

Monographic literature was used most in Korean studies as a whole, accounting for 59 percent of all materials cited. However, the use of monographic literature declined in the fourth period, even though it still remained the most used format, while the use of serials has increased, especially newspapers, as the number of articles on politics & government increased. History and politics & government cited the widest variety of formats. Generally, monographs were more heavily cited in disciplines within the humanities than within the social sciences, with the exception of economics and language. Different author groups within disciplines show generally similar citation behavior in terms of the format of the materials. The only significant difference was found with regard to Korean-American authors in language research. Only 37.3 percent of their citations were to monographs, compared to over 60 percent for the others.

The mean age of publications cited for the 20-year timespan was 20.87 and the median age of publications cited was 12. The Price Index of Korean studies as a whole is 21.9 percent for the 20-year timespan, which approximates the upper limit for fields in the humanities and the lower limit for social sciences. Disciplines in the social sciences, such as anthropology & sociology, economics, and politics & government mostly cited more sources published within the previous 5 years, while disciplines in the humanities, such as history, language, literature, and philosophy & religion cited more sources 6-10 years old. Comparison of different author groups in each discipline suggests that their different citation patterns in term of age of publication generally reflect their choice of subject matter, even though there were some exceptions. Among monographs, those 6-10 years old were cited most in Korean studies in general. For serials, on the other hand, those published within 5 years received the most citations. Those most cited dissertations and theses were produced within the previous 10 years. Among unpublished conference papers, those produced within the previous 5 years received the most attention.

Sources written in English were most cited, accounting for 47.1% of all sources cited. References to Korean language sources (including sources in Hancha) amounted to only 34.9% of all sources. Articles in the social science disciplines relied on sources in English far more than on sources in Korean. Research in the field of language cited sources in the greatest variety of languages. The field of literature, followed by philosophy & religion, showed the highest citation rate for sources translated from Korean into English. In general, American and Korean-American authors were the most significant users of sources in English. American authors cited English sources the most

in all fields. Korean-Americans also prefer English sources, but show a more even balance between sources in English and in Korean in the field of language and literature. Koreans prefer sources in the Korean language, but relied heavily on sources in English in the fields of economics and language. Europeans and Japanese-Americans cited Korean sources at a much higher rate than did Americans or Korean-Americans in the field of history.

Articles on economics and on politics & government mostly cited sources published in the U.S., while articles on literature and on philosophy & religion relied mostly on sources published in Korea. In general, authors preferred sources published in their own countries, with the exception of Europeans. While Europeans cited Korean sources at the rate of 64% and U.S. sources at the rate of 14%, American authors cited both in almost equal proportions.

Sources on history were cited most by other disciplines. The field of language shows the highest subject self-citation rate (70.5%), followed by history (63.7%), and then economics (61.5%). Anthropology & sociology and politics & government show the most interdisciplinary citation patterns. In general, Korean authors tend to show the highest subject self-citation rate in several fields, compared to Americans or Korean-Americans.

No significant core authors were identified. A total of 4,160 individuals or co-authors produced 7,166 cited works, averaging 1.72 citations per author. No significant core literature were identified either. The total of 7,166 citations in 198 articles breaks into 2,899 monograph titles, 665 serial titles, 123 doctoral or master's theses, 161

unpublished titles, and 84 titles in all other categories. The average citations to each of these titles are 1.82. The fields of history and language (in which 16.2% to 17.8% of the total cited authors are responsible for 50% of all cited works) show more prestigious author groups than others, while anthropology & sociology show the most scattered author dispersion (in which 41.8% of the total number of cited authors are responsible for 50% of all cited works).

Not many secondary authors are highly cited across disciplines. James B. Palais, Bruce Cumings, and Lee Chong-sik were frequently cited in three different disciplines and nine authors (Han U-gun, Yi Ki-baek, Yi Kwang-nin, Edward W. Wagner, Sin Yong-ha, Martina Deuchler, Fukaya Toshikane, Sudo Yoshiyuki, Yi Sang-baek) were frequently cited in two disciplines. The *Choson Wangjo Sillok* appears to be an important primary source in studies of Korea's Yi Dynasty. No secondary monographic literature was identified as a corpus of classic or prestigious titles in Korean studies as a whole. Although a few monographic works were identified as highly cited titles in each discipline, none of them received a significant number of citations by wide variety of articles. Some journal titles appear to be important in several disciplines in Korean studies. *Korea Journal* was highly cited in five disciplines: anthropology & sociology, history, literature, philosophy & religion, and politics & government; the *Journal of Korean Studies*, *Occasional Papers on Korea*, and *Asian Survey* were cited frequently in three disciplines; and *Yoksa Hakpo*, *Shigaku Zasshi*, *Far Eastern Economic Review*, *Journal of Asian Studies*, *Korean Repository*, *Sin Tonga*, *Korea Newsreview*, and *World Politics* received relatively frequent citations in two disciplines.

Implications of the Study

Since there have been wide gaps in the subject coverage in Korean studies research over the past 20 years, some way of promoting research in less studied disciplines, such as arts and philosophy & religion, needs to be sought in order to promote well-balanced development in the field. Granting agencies might look into this problem when they provide support for Korean studies research.

The two Korean studies journals appear to have been more or less 'house' journals of their sponsoring institutions. They need to solicit more papers written by authors outside their affiliated institutions. This may raise the quality of the journals, offer wider subject coverage, and attract more diverse readership, all of which would facilitate healthy growth in Korean studies.

The Korean studies community that published articles in North America cited far more sources in English (47.1%) than in Korean (34.9%), despite the tremendous difference in the number of publications on Korea in each language. While American historians writing about the history of modern Germany cited German-language sources at rates of about 63%, historians publishing in these four journals cited Korean-language sources at the rate of only 43.4%. When considering the percentage of the cited sources published in Korea (43.4%) and the U.S. (32.8%), it is clear that the Korean studies community publishing in North America greatly prefers sources in English. Among the reasons for this phenomenon, as discussed under 'Literature Review', might be: (1) lack of proficiency in the Korean language on the part of American authors; (2) lack of awareness of Korean-language materials due to poor coverage of such materials by

secondary services; (3) the tendency of authors to cite sources in the same language of the publication in which they publish their works; and/or (4) the perceived unimportance of foreign literature. This preference for sources in English has diminished formal communication between Korean scholars in Korea and Koreanists in North America. This lack of communication is demonstrated by this study, which was not able to distinguish any core or prestigious literature in the field.

Improvement would seem to require some cooperation and collaboration by the various parties in Korean studies. Non-native speakers of Korean who intend to work in the field need to acquire proficiency in the language. More support and more work is needed to translate significant works from Korean into English and to produce far more publications on Korea in English. The lack of secondary services is much resolved in this global information age, since large corpora of library catalogs and information about books are available online. However, timely and well-covered indexing and abstracting services for periodicals are still needed, especially in area studies.

This study found very few established trends for this past 20-year period in the history of Korean studies. The proportions of disciplinary subject coverage have fluctuated and a body of key contributing authors and no key literature has yet to be established. This might result from the fact that Korean studies is oriented toward the humanities or the soft side of social sciences, but it might also suggest no more than the field is still evolving. On the other hand, the diversity found in this study may be directly reflecting the very nature of Korean studies.

For collection development purposes, this study suggests that as many and as great a variety of monographs as possible need to be collected for Korean studies, since in general more monographs are cited than any other formats. At the same time, however, no prestigious titles are identified either for each discipline or for Korean studies in general. The same suggestion applies to journal titles. Since most of the journals in Korean studies are published less frequently (annually or semiannually), not many articles are available through each title. As shown in this study, citations to journal titles are very scattered. Therefore, a large number of journal titles need to be collected to serve the Korean studies community.

Although most of the materials cited are 0-10 years old, acquisition of reprints or originals of historical sources, as well as more recent publications, are also important to support research in history, philosophy & religion, literature, and other studies dealing with historical aspects, such as economic history. Since there are not many sources available in English, and authors working in Korean studies in North America demonstrably prefer English sources, the need to locate and collect Korean studies sources in English cannot be overemphasized.

Suggestions for Further Research

As the first of its kind, this study is in no position to draw any broad conclusions about trends in Korean studies or to characterize in general terms the literature of the field. In order to have more generalized knowledge of Korean studies and information use by the Korean studies community, first of all, several other sets of literature need to be examined, for example, articles in journals other than the four chosen for this study;

articles on Korea in other journals, monographs, and dissertations of various disciplines; and also works published in Korea.

In order to complement the results of bibliometric studies, other studies of information seeking and use need to be carried out, for example, surveys through questionnaires and interviews, observations of the actual behavior of information seekers and users, studies of library circulation and interlibrary loans, and analysis of the contents of mailing list postings in Korean studies.

A follow-up study might also be useful, to reexamine articles in the four journals to observe changes since 1996 and to identify any impacts of current information technologies that facilitate much closer contact among geographically separated scholars.

Studies of this kind in other area studies fields are also necessary. Since this is the first attempt to examine the literature within the domain of area studies, there is not yet any information available to compare between and among area studies fields with different foci. It is not known whether the trends and the characteristics of the literature found in this study are peculiar to Korean studies or are common to area studies in general. It is especially important to compile comparable results from area studies fields where English-speaking researchers must access literature in radically different writing systems, as in Chinese or Japanese studies in North America.

APPENDIX A

TABLES 35-39

TABLES 35-39:

DISCIPLINES, COUNTRY OF ORIGIN OF AUTHORS, AND

FORM OF PUBLICATION

Table 35. Country of Origin of Authors and Form of Publication, Economics

	American	Korean	Korean- American	Total
Monographs				
Books	60 42.6%	35 34.3%	75 40.5%	244 40.9%
Collections	24 17.0%	34 33.3%	20 10.8%	95 15.9%
Pamphlets		1 1.0%	2 1.1%	4 .7%
Government				
Books	5 3.5%	8 7.8%	8 4.3%	36 6.0%
Collections			1 .5%	2 .3%
Subtotal	89 63.1%	78 76.4%	106 57.2%	381 63.8%
Serials				
Periodicals	31 22.0%	15 14.7%	38 20.5%	124 20.8%
Annuals	6 4.3%	2 2.0%		9 1.5%
Newspapers	1 .7%		2 1.1%	8 1.3%
Government				
Periodicals	3 2.1%	1 1.0%	3 1.6%	7 1.2%
Annuals	3 2.1%	4 3.9%	2 1.1%	14 2.3%
Subtotal	44 31.2%	22 21.6%	45 24.3%	162 27.1%

(table continue)

Table 19. (*continued*)

	American	Korean	Korean- American	Total
Unpublished				
Theses	5 3.5%	2 2.0%	13 7.0%	23 3.9%
Government	1 .7%		2 1.1%	7 1.2%
Personal			10 5.4%	13 2.2%
Subtotal	6 4.2%	2 2.0%	25 13.5%	43 7.3%
Other				
Interviews	1 .7%		9 4.9%	10 1.7%
Unknown	1 .7%			1 .2%
Subtotal	2 1.4%		9 4.9%	11 1.9%
Total	141 100.0%	102 100.0%	185 100.0%	597 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in economics.

Table 36. Country of Origin of Authors and Form of Publication, History

	American	European	Japanese- American	Korean	Korean- American	Total
Monographs						
Books	578 41.8%	79 41.6%	74 25.3%	169 44.8%	184 46.5%	1,156 40.6%
Collections	216 15.6%	45 23.7%	48 16.4%	59 15.6%	58 14.6%	436 15.3%
Pamphlets				1 0.3%		2 0.1%
Government						
Books	41 3.0%	8 4.2%	2 .7%	8 2.1%	7 1.8%	69 2.4%
Collections	7 0.5%	2 1.1%	5 1.7%	3 0.8%	5 1.3%	26 0.9%
Pamphlets	1 0.1%					1 0.0%
Subtotal	843 61.0%	134 70.6%	129 44.1%	240 63.6%	254 64.2%	1,690 59.3%
Serials						
Periodicals	355 25.7%	31 16.3%	155 53.1%	100 26.5%	115 29.0%	786 27.6%
Annuals	6 0.4%			1 0.3%	1 0.3%	8 0.3%
Newspapers	68 4.9%	21 11.1%	1 .3%	17 4.5%	13 3.3%	187 6.6%
Government						
Periodicals	5 0.4%		1 0.3%			13 0.5%
Annuals	3 0.2%					3 0.1%
Subtotal	437 31.6%	52 27.4%	157 53.7%	118 31.3%	129 32.6%	997 35.1%

(table continue)

Table 36. *(continued)*

	American	European	Japanese-American	Korean	Korean-American	Total
Unpublished						
Theses	35 2.5%	3 1.6%	1 0.3%	11 2.9%	6 1.5%	60 2.1%
Government	37 2.7%			3 0.8%	2 0.5%	50 1.8%
Personal	19 1.4%	1 0.5%	3 1.0%	3 0.8%	2 0.5%	28 1.0%
Subtotal	91 6.6%	4 2.1%	4 1.3%	17 4.5%	10 2.5%	138 4.9%
Other						
Interviews	3 0.2%				2 0.5%	5 0.2%
Miscellaneous	2 0.1%		2 0.7%			4 0.1%
News items	7 0.5%				1 0.3%	8 0.3%
Unknown	1 0.1%			2 0.5%		3 0.1%
Subtotal	13 0.9%		2 0.7%	2 0.5%	3 0.8%	20 0.7%
Total	1,384 100.0%	190 100.0%	292 100.0%	377 100.0%	396 100.0%	2,845 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in history.

Table 37. Country of Origin of Authors and Form of Publication, Language

	American	Korean	Korean- American	Total
Monographs				
Books	89 52.0%	23 41.1%	81 29.3%	227 41.4%
Collections	26 15.2%	13 23.2%	22 8.0%	62 11.3%
Subtotal	115 67.2%	36 64.3%	103 37.3%	289 52.7%
Serials				
Periodicals	51 29.8%	14 25.0%	147 53.3%	222 40.5%
Annuals	3 1.8%		4 1.4%	7 1.3%
Newspapers	1 0.6%		4 1.4%	5 0.9%
Subtotal	55 32.2%	14 25.0%	155 56.1%	234 42.7%
Unpublished				
Theses		5 8.9%	14 5.1%	19 3.5%
Personal	1 .6%	1 1.8%	4 1.4%	6 1.1%
Subtotal	1 .6%	6 10.7%	18 6.5%	25 4.6%
Total	171 100.0%	56 100.0%	276 100.0%	548 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in language.

Table 38. Country of Origin of Authors and Form of Publication, Literature

	American	Korean	Korean- American	Total
Monographs				
Books	80 47.3%	16 38.1%	77 53.1%	191 48.0%
Collections	45 26.6%	17 40.5%	34 23.4%	116 29.1%
Pamphlets				1 0.3%
Government				
Books			1 0.7%	1 0.3%
Collections				1 0.3%
Subtotal	125 73.9%	33 78.6%	112 77.2%	310 78.0%
Serials				
Periodicals	29 17.2%	7 16.7%	18 12.4%	56 14.1%
Newspapers	5 3.0%	2 4.8%	9 6.2%	16 4.0%
Subtotal	34 20.2%	9 21.5%	27 18.6%	72 18.1%
Unpublished				
Theses	2 1.2%		1 0.7%	3 0.8%
Government			1 0.7%	1 0.3%
Personal	5 3.0%		3 2.1%	8 2.0%
Subtotal	5 4.2%		5 3.5%	12 3.1%
Other				
Interviews	1 0.6%		1 0.7%	2 0.5%
Miscellaneous	2 1.2%			2 0.5%
Subtotal	3 1.8%		1 0.7%	4 1.0%
Total	169 100.0%	42 100.0%	145 100.0%	398 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in literature.

Table 39. Country of Origin of Authors and Form of Publication,
Politics & Government

	American	Korean- American	Total
Monographs			
Books	77 32.8%	135 24.2%	280 27.5%
Collections	21 8.9%	55 9.8%	103 10.1%
Pamphlets		4 0.7%	5 0.5%
Government			
Books	1 0.4%	22 3.9%	30 2.9%
Collections		1 0.2%	10 1.0%
Pamphlets		6 1.1%	8 0.8%
Subtotal	99 42.1%	223 39.9%	436 42.8%
Serials			
Periodicals	73 31.1%	117 20.9%	230 22.5%
Annuals		5 0.9%	7 0.7%
Newspapers	22 9.4%	152 27.2%	224 22.0%
Government			
Periodicals	11 4.7%	25 4.5%	38 3.7%
Annuals	2 0.9%	4 0.7%	7 0.7%
Newspapers		3 0.5%	3 0.3%
Subtotal	108 46.1%	306 54.7%	509 49.9%

(table continue)

Table 39. *(continued)*

	American	Korean- American	Total
Unpublished			
Theses	1 0.4%	3 0.5%	11 1.1%
Government		5 0.9%	5 0.5%
Personal	9 3.8%	12 2.1%	22 2.2%
Subtotal	10 4.2%	20 3.5%	38 3.8%
Other			
Interviews		9 1.6%	9 0.9%
Miscellaneous		1 0.2%	2 0.2%
News item	16 6.8%		24 2.4%
Unknown	2 0.9%		2 0.2%
Subtotal	18 7.7%	10 1.8%	37 3.7%
Total	235 100.0%	559 100.0%	1,020 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in politics & government.

APPENDIX B

TABLES 40-44

TABLES 40-44:

DISCIPLINES, COUNTRY OF ORIGIN OF AUTHORS, AND

AGE OF PUBLICATION

Table 40. Country of Origin of Authors and Age of Publication, Economics

	American	Korean	Korean- American	Total
0-5	15 10.7%	30 29.4%	45 25.4%	140 23.9%
6-10	23 16.4%	28 27.5%	39 22.0%	126 21.5%
11-15	19 13.6%	25 24.5%	24 13.6%	86 14.7%
16-20	12 8.6%	2 2.0%	14 7.9%	47 8.0%
21-25	9 6.4%	11 10.8%	14 7.9%	51 8.7%
26-30	7 5.0%	4 3.9%	8 4.5%	38 6.5%
31-35	1 0.7%	1 1.0%	3 1.7%	7 1.2%
36-40	3 2.1%		2 1.1%	9 1.5%
41-45	4 2.9%		2 1.1%	7 1.2%
46-50	19 13.6%		5 2.8%	25 4.3%
51-55	19 13.6%		6 3.4%	25 4.3%
56-60	8 5.7%	1 1.0%	9 5.1%	18 3.1%
61-65	1 0.7%		4 2.3%	5 0.9%
66-70			2 1.1%	2 0.3%
Total	140 100.0%	102 100.0%	177 100.0%	586 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in economics.

Table 41. Country of Origin of Authors and Age of Publication, History

	American	European	Japanese- American	Korean	Korean- American	Total
0-5	177 13.4%	46 24.7%	29 10.0%	56 15.4%	66 17.0%	381 13.9%
6-10	287 21.7%	30 16.1%	60 20.8%	59 16.3%	70 18.0%	532 19.4%
11-15	214 16.2%	15 8.1%	65 22.5%	54 14.9%	63 16.2%	427 15.5%
16-20	125 9.5%	19 10.2%	54 18.7%	37 10.2%	60 15.5%	311 11.3%
21-25	104 7.9%	16 8.6%	19 6.6%	28 7.7%	32 8.2%	204 7.4%
26-30	54 4.1%	17 9.1%	10 3.5%	18 5.0%	16 4.1%	123 4.5%
31-35	95 7.2%	7 3.8%	7 2.4%	9 2.5%	12 3.1%	141 5.1%
36-40	18 1.4%	3 1.6%	13 4.5%	10 2.8%	9 2.3%	56 2.0%
41-45	37 2.8%	3 1.6%	9 3.1%	12 3.3%	9 2.3%	74 2.7%
46-50	75 5.7%	1 .5%	4 1.4%	18 5.0%	7 1.8%	109 4.0%
51-55	21 1.6%	4 2.2%	4 1.4%	7 1.9%	6 1.5%	45 1.6%
56-60	26 2.0%	5 2.7%	3 1.0%	4 1.1%	6 1.5%	49 1.8%
61-65	27 2.0%	1 0.5%	2 0.7%	5 1.4%	3 0.8%	38 1.4%
66-70	19 1.4%	6 3.2%	2 0.7%	6 1.7%	5 1.3%	39 1.4%
71-75	4 0.3%	4 2.2%	2 0.7%	5 1.4%	1 0.3%	22 0.8%
76-80	12 0.9%		1 0.3%	4 1.1%	3 0.8%	32 1.2%

(table continue)

Table 41. (*continued*)

	American	European	Japanese- American	Korean	Korean- American	Total
81-85	5 0.4%		1 0.3%	4 1.1%	5 1.3%	19 0.7%
86-90	11 0.8%	2 1.1%		19 5.2%	13 3.4%	113 4.1%
91-95	4 0.3%	2 1.1%		2 0.6%	1 0.3%	9 0.3%
96-100	2 0.2%	1 0.5%	1 0.3%	5 1.4%	1 0.3%	10 0.4%
101-200	1 0.1%	1 0.5%	1 0.3%	1 0.3%		4 0.2%
201-300	2 0.2	2 1.0%				4 0.2%
301-390	1 0.1%	1 0.5%	2 0.6			4 0.2%
Total	1,321 100.0%	186 100.0%	289 100.0%	363 100.0%	388 100.0%	2,746 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in history.

Table 42. Country of Origin of Authors and Age of Publication, Language

	American	Korean	Korean- American	Total
0-5	47 27.5%	12 21.4%	50 18.1%	123 22.4%
6-10	38 22.2%	18 32.1%	69 25.0%	130 23.7%
11-15	30 17.5%	11 19.6%	49 17.8%	97 17.7%
16-20	17 9.9%	7 12.5%	48 17.4%	78 14.2%
21-25	7 4.1%	5 8.9%	16 5.8%	31 5.7%
26-30	8 4.7%	1 1.8%	11 4.0%	24 4.4%
31-35	6 3.5%	1 1.8%	3 1.1%	12 2.2%
36-40	4 2.3%		1 0.4%	6 1.1%
41-45	1 0.6%		5 1.8%	8 1.5%
46-50	1 0.6%		5 1.8%	6 1.1%
51-55	2 1.2%		4 1.4%	6 1.1%
56-60	4 2.3%		3 1.1%	7 1.3%
61-65	1 0.6%		2 0.7%	3 0.5%
66-70	2 1.2%		2 0.7%	4 0.7%
71-75		1 1.8%	2 0.7%	3 0.5%
76-80	1 0.6%			2 0.4%
81-85	1 0.6%		1 0.4%	2 0.4%
86-90			2 0.7%	2 0.4%
91-95			1 0.4%	1 0.2%
96-100	1 0.6%			1 0.2%
101-130			2 0.7%	2 0.4%
Total	171 100.0%	56 100.0%	276 100.0%	548 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in language.

Table 43. Country of Origin of Authors and Age of Publication, Literature

	American	Korean	Korean- American	Total
0-5	42 25.3%	15 35.7%	12 8.8%	73 18.9%
6-10	33 19.9%	5 11.9%	33 24.1%	75 19.4%
11-15	27 16.3%	2 4.8%	18 13.1%	52 13.4%
16-20	17 10.2%	8 19.0%	19 13.9%	51 13.2%
21-25	24 14.5%	8 19.0%	12 8.8%	46 11.9%
26-30	7 4.2%	1 2.4%	10 7.3%	24 6.2%
31-35	3 1.8%	1 2.4%	10 7.3%	23 5.9%
36-40			3 2.2%	5 1.3%
41-45	4 2.4%		2 1.5%	8 2.1%
46-50	2 1.2%		1 0.7%	4 1.0%
51-55	2 1.2%	2 4.8%	2 1.5%	6 1.6%
56-60			1 0.7%	1 0.3%
61-65	2 1.2%		1 0.7%	3 0.8%
66-70	1 0.6%			1 0.3%
71-75			2 1.5%	2 0.5%
81-85	1 0.6%		8 5.8%	9 2.3%
86-90			2 1.5%	2 0.5%
95-100	1 0.6%			1 0.3%
251-260			1 0.7%	1 0.3%
Total	166 100.0%	42 100.0%	137 100.0%	387 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in literature.

Table 44. Country of Origin of Authors and Age of Publication,
Politics & Government

	American	Korean- American	Total
0-5	67 28.5%	256 46.0%	428 42.1%
6-10	100 42.6%	104 18.7%	243 23.9%
11-15	23 9.8%	45 8.1%	97 9.5%
16-20	23 9.8%	35 6.3%	73 7.2%
21-25	5 2.1%	26 4.7%	45 4.4%
26-30	4 1.7%	13 2.3%	31 3.0%
31-35	7 3.0%	71 12.8%	82 8.1%
36-40	3 1.3%	2 0.4%	7 0.7%
41-45	1 0.4%	3 0.5%	4 0.4%
46-50	2 0.9%		3 0.3%
51-55		1 0.2%	2 0.2%
56-60			1 0.1%
71-75			1 0.1%
Total	235 100.0%	556 100.0%	1,017 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in politics & government.

APPENDIX C

TABLES 45-49

TABLES 45-49:

DISCIPLINES, COUNTRY OF ORIGIN OF AUTHORS, AND
LANGUAGE OF PUBLICATION

Table 45. Country of Origin of Authors and Language of Publication,
Economics

	Amer.	Kor.	Kor.- Amer.	Total
English	62 44.0%	65 63.7%	96 51.9%	354 59.3%
Korean	28 19.9%	34 33.3%	46 24.9%	144 24.1%
Japanese	51 36.2%	1 1.0%	41 22.2%	93 15.6%
Kor/Eng		2 2.0%		4 .7%
Unknown			2 1.0%	2 .4%
Total	141 100.0%	102 100.0%	185 100.0%	597 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in economics.

Table 46. Country of Origin of Authors and Language of Publication, History

	Amer.	Euro.	Jap.- Amer.	Kor.	Kor.- Amer.	Total
Korean	353 25.5%	96 50.5%	219 75.0%	167 44.3%	163 41.2%	1,045 36.7%
English	629 45.4%	39 20.5%	25 8.6%	99 26.3%	125 31.6%	1,038 36.5%
Japanese	251 18.1%	5 2.6%	33 11.3%	67 17.8%	67 16.9%	450 15.8%
Hancha	79 5.7%	39 20.5%	15 5.1%	26 6.9%	29 7.3%	190 6.7%
Chinese	51 3.7%	4 2.1%		16 4.2%	9 2.3%	80 2.8%
German	6 0.4%	4 2.1%			1 0.3%	13 0.5%
French	9 0.7%	1 0.5%				11 0.4%
Russian		1 0.5%		1 0.3%		8 0.3%
Han/Kor		1 0.5%		1 0.3%	1 0.3%	3 0.1%
Kor/Eng	2 0.1%					2 0.1%
Unknown	4 0.3%				1 0.3%	5 0.1%
Total	1,384 100.0%	190 100.0%	292 100.0%	377 100.0%	396 100.0%	2,845 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in history.

Table 47. Country of Origin of Authors and Language of Publication,
Language

	Amer.	Kor.	Kor.- Amer.	Total
English	66 38.6%	43 76.8%	111 40.2%	236 43.1%
Korean	17 9.9%	12 21.4%	104 37.7%	151 27.6%
Japanese	40 23.4%	1 1.8%	35 12.7%	84 15.3%
German	25 14.6%		16 5.8%	42 7.7%
Russian	9 5.3%		4 1.4%	13 2.4%
French	6 3.5%		5 1.8%	11 2.0%
Kor/Eng	2 1.2%		1 0.4%	4 0.7%
Chinese	1 0.6%			2 0.4%
Hancha	1 0.6%			1 0.2%
Jap/Eng	1 0.6%			1 0.2%
Man/Eng	1 0.6%			1 0.2%
Tur/Rus	1 0.6%			1 0.2%
Turkish	1 0.6%			1 0.2%
Total	171 100.0%	56 100.0%	276 100.0%	548 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in language.

Table 48. Country of Origin of Authors and Language of Publication,
Literature

	Amer.	Kor.	Kor.- Amer.	Total
Korean	63 37.3%	28 66.7%	70 48.3%	189 47.5%
English	105 62.1%	13 31.0%	58 40.0%	185 46.5%
Hancha			10 6.9%	10 2.5%
German				4 1.0%
Japanese	1 0.6%		3 2.1%	4 1.0%
Chinese			3 2.1%	3 0.8%
French		1 2.4%	1 0.7%	2 0.5%
Russian				1 0.3%
Total	169 100.0%	42 100.0%	145 100.0%	398 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in literature.

Table 49. Country of Origin of Authors and Language of Publication, Politics & Government

	Amer.	Kor.- Amer.	Total
English	198 84.3%	436 78.0%	759 74.4%
Korean	35 14.9%	95 17.0%	186 18.2%
Japanese		21 3.8%	50 4.9%
Chinese		3 0.5%	7 0.7%
German			5 0.5%
Kor/Eng	2 0.8%	2 0.4%	5 0.5%
Russian			3 0.3%
French			3 0.3%
Unknown		2 0.4%	2 0.2%
Total	235 100.0%	559 100.0%	1,020 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in politics & government.

APPENDIX D

TABLES 50-54

TABLES 50-54:

DISCIPLINES, COUNTRY OF ORIGIN OF AUTHORS, AND

PLACE OF PUBLICATION

Table 50. Country of Origin of Authors and Place of Publication, Economics

	Amer.	Kor.	Kor. -Amer.	Total
USA	49 34.8%	43 42.2%	84 45.4%	272 45.6%
ROK	35 24.8%	51 50.0%	50 27.0%	194 32.5%
Pre-1948 Korea	23 16.3%		19 10.3%	42 7.0%
DPRK		1 1.0%	2 1.1%	3 .5%
Japan	30 21.3%	1 1.0%	21 11.4%	55 9.2%
UK	1 .7%	3 2.9%	1 .5%	10 1.7%
8 other countries	3 2.1%	3 3.0%	5 2.5%	18 3.1%
Unknown			3 1.6%	3 .5%
Total	141 100.0%	102 100.0%	185 100.0%	597 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in economics.

Table 51. Country of Origin of Authors and Place of Publication, History

	Amer.	Euro.	Jap.- Amer.	Kor.	Kor.- Amer.	Total
ROK	419 30.3%	121 63.7%	213 72.9%	183 48.5%	155 39.1%	1,114 39.2%
Pre-1948 Korea	103 7.4%	14 7.4%	33 11.3%	36 9.5%	34 8.6%	284 10.0%
DPRK	13 .9%	3 1.6%		10 2.7%	33 8.3%	59 2.1%
USA	484 35.0%	23 12.1%	14 4.8%	50 13.3%	84 21.2%	738 25.9%
Japan	247 17.8%	6 3.2%	29 9.9%	64 17.0%	63 15.9%	433 15.2%
China and Taiwan	53 3.8%	12 6.3%		24 6.4%	9 2.3%	98 3.4%
UK	24 1.7%	4 2.1%	2 0.7%	5 1.3%	11 2.8%	49 1.7%
Germany	10 .7%	4 2.1%	0	1 0.3%		17 0.6%
12 other countries	24 1.8%	1 .5%	1 0.3%	1 0.3%	7 1.8%	41 1.4%
Unknown	7 0.5%	2 1.1%		3 0.8%		12 0.4%
Total	1,384 100.0%	190 100.0%	292 100.0%	377 100.0%	396 100.0%	2,845 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in history.

Table 52. Country of Origin of Authors and Place of Publication, Language

	Amer.	Kor.	Kor. -Amer.	Total
ROK	19 11.1%	15 26.8%	46 16.7%	96 17.5%
Pre-1948 Korea	3 1.8%		5 1.8%	9 1.6%
DPRK		1 1.8%	65 23.6%	69 12.6%
USA	35 20.5%	34 60.7%	77 27.9%	156 28.5%
Japan	45 26.3%	3 5.4%	43 15.6%	99 18.1%
Germany	29 17.0%		12 4.3%	42 7.7%
USSR	11 6.4%		4 1.4%	16 2.9%
Finland	10 5.8%		4 1.4%	15 2.7%
Netherlands	4 2.3%	1 1.8%	5 1.8%	10 1.8%
UK	3 1.8%	1 1.8%	4 1.4%	10 1.8%
France	4 2.3%		5 1.8%	9 1.6%
12 other countries	8 4.7%	1 1.8%	6 2.4%	17 3.3%
Total	171 100.0%	56 100.0%	276 100.0%	548 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in language.

Table 53. Country of Origin of Authors and Place of Publication, Literature

	Amer.	Kor.	Kor. -Amer.	Total
ROK	68 40.2%	32 76.2%	70 48.3%	188 47.2%
Pre-1948 Korea	7 4.1%	1 2.4%	13 9.0%	21 5.3%
DPRK	5 3.0%	1 2.4%	1 .7%	18 4.5%
USA	73 43.2%	6 14.3%	46 31.7%	132 33.2%
UK	10 5.9%	1 2.4%	6 4.1%	17 4.3%
Japan	2 1.2%		3 2.1%	5 1.3%
7 other countries	3 1.8%	1 2.4%	5 3.5%	15 4.1%
Unknown	1 0.6%		1 0.7%	2 0.5%
Total	169 100.0%	42 100.0%	145 100.0%	398 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in literature.

Table 54. Country of Origin of Authors and Place of Publication,
Politics & Government

	Amer.	Kor.- Amer.	Total
USA	126 53.6%	285 51.0%	500 49.0%
ROK	64 27.2%	156 27.9%	270 26.5%
DPRK	31 13.2%	39 7.0%	96 9.4%
Japan	1 0.4%	52 9.3%	84 8.2%
UK	2 0.9%	6 1.1%	17 1.7%
Hong Kong	5 2.1%	10 1.8%	16 1.6%
10 other countries	2 0.8%	7 1.3%	29 2.9%
Unknown	4 1.7%	4 0.7%	8 0.8%
Total	235 100.0%	559 100.0%	1020 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in politics & government.

APPENDIX E
TABLES 55-59

TABLES 55-59:

DISCIPLINES, COUNTRY OF ORIGIN OF AUTHORS, AND

SUBJECT OF PUBLICATION

Table 55. Country of Origin of Authors and Subject of Publication,
Economics

	Amer.	Kor.	Kor.-Amer.	Total
A	2 1.4%		6 3.2%	22 3.7%
B			2 1.1%	5 0.8%
C	1 0.7%			1 0.2%
D	28 19.9%	6 5.9%	40 21.6%	96 16.1%
E-F				3 0.5%
G				2 0.3%
H-HJ	90 63.8%	86 84.3%	100 54.0%	367 61.5%
HM-HX	8 5.7%	7 6.9%	11 5.9%	35 5.9%
J	6 4.3%	3 2.9%	7 3.8%	36 6.0%
L			1 0.5%	1 0.2%
S	3 2.1%			3 0.5%
Q				1 0.2%
Misc.	3 2.1%		18 9.8%	25 4.2%
Total	141 100.0%	102 100.0%	185 100.0%	597 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in economics.

Table 56. Country of Origin of Authors and Subject of Publication, History

	Amer.	Euro.	Jap.- Amer.	Kor.	Kor.- Amer.	Total
A	123 8.9%	27 14.2%	20 6.8%	30 8.0%	30 7.6%	302 10.6%
B	68 4.9%	24 12.6%	5 1.7%	17 4.5%	19 4.8%	134 4.7%
C	46 3.3%	4 2.1%	11 3.8%	1 0.3%	3 0.8%	66 2.3%
D	787 56.9%	102 53.7%	219 75.0%	267 70.8%	245 61.9%	1,704 59.9%
E-F	18 1.3%	1 0.5%		7 1.9%	2 0.5%	42 1.5%
G	27 2.0%	1 0.5%	1 0.3%	4 1.1%	14 3.5%	51 1.8%
H-HJ	48 3.4%	1 0.5%	5 1.7%	20 5.3%	15 3.8%	89 3.1%
HM-HX	50 3.6%	7 3.7%		3 0.8%	6 1.5%	67 2.4%
J	64 4.6%	3 1.6%	4 1.4%	7 1.9%	12 3.0%	110 3.9%
K	10 0.7%	7 3.7%	1 0.3%	1 0.3%	2 0.5%	21 0.7%
L	6 0.4%			1 0.3%	2 0.5%	9 0.3%
M					2 0.5%	2 0.1%
N	16 1.2%					16 0.6%
P (Lang.)	6 0.4%		2 0.6%	1 0.3%	7 1.9%	16 0.4%
P (Lit.)	34 2.5%	11 5.7%	21 7.2%	10 2.6%	26 6.6%	102 3.6%
Q	2 0.1%				1 0.3%	3 0.1%
R	1 0.1%					1 0.0%
S	4 0.3%			1 0.3%	2 0.5%	7 0.2%
U; V	5 0.4%			1 0.3%		7 0.2%
Z	8 0.6%		1 0.3%		3 0.8%	12 0.4%
Misc.	61 4.4%	2 1.1%	2 0.7%	6 1.6%	5 1.3%	84 2.9%
Total	1,384 100.0%	190 100.0%	292 100.0%	377 100.0%	396 100.0%	2,845 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in history.

Table 57. Country of Origin of Authors and Subject of Publication, Language

	Amer.	Kor.	Kor.- Amer.	Total
A	1 .6%		24 8.7%	25 4.6%
B	1 .6%	9 16.1%		10 1.8%
C		1 1.8%		1 .2%
D	43 25.1%	1 1.8%	27 9.8%	76 13.9%
G	1 .6%		8 2.9%	9 1.6%
HM-HX		4 7.1%	1 .4%	5 .9%
L		1 1.8%	1 .4%	2 .4%
N	1 .6%			1 .2%
P (Lang.)	105 61.4	33 59.0%	210 76.1%	387 70.5%
P (Lit.)	17 10.0%	1 1.8%	1 .4%	20 3.7%
Q; T	1 .6%	4 7.2%	2 .8%	7 1.3%
R		2 3.6%		2 .4%
Z			1 .4%	1 .2%
Misc.	1 .6%		1 .4%	2 .4%
Total	171 100.0%	56 100.0%	276 100.0%	548 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in language.

Table 58. Country of Origin of Authors and Subject of Publication, Literature

	Amer.	Kor.	Kor.- Amer.	Total
A	16 9.5%	8 19.0%	14 9.7%	38 9.5%
B	10 5.9%		7 4.8%	17 4.3%
C	1 0.6%			1 0.3%
D	36 21.3%		45 31.0%	83 20.9%
E-F	1 0.6%			1 0.3%
G	1 0.6%			1 0.3%
H-HJ	1 0.6%			1 0.3%
HM-HX	4 2.4%		3 2.1%	9 2.3%
J	4 2.4%		1 .7%	6 1.5%
M	2 1.2%			2 .5%
N		1 2.4%		1 .3%
P (Lang.)	8 4.8%	3 7.1%	13 8.9%	30 7.6%
P (Lit.)	80 47.4%	30 71.4%	59 40.7%	200 50.2%
Z			2 1.4%	2 .5%
Misc.	5 3.0%		1 .7%	6 1.6%
Total	169 100.0%	42 100.0%	145 100.0%	398 100.0%

Note. The totals are of all articles in literature.

Table 59. Country of Origin of Authors and Subject of Publication, Politics & Government

	Amer.	Kor. -Amer.	Total
A	34 14.5%	165 29.5%	252 24.7%
B	1 .4%	6 1.1%	10 1.0%
D	74 31.5%	181 32.4%	302 29.6%
E-F	2 .9%	16 2.9%	27 2.6%
G		2 .4%	2 .2%
H-HJ	19 8.1%	32 5.7%	58 5.7%
HM-HX	26 11.1%	39 7.0%	94 9.2%
J	47 20.0%	77 13.8%	171 16.8%
K	13 5.5%	7 1.3%	34 3.3%
L		6 1.1%	8 0.8%
P (Lang.)	1 0.4%	1 0.2%	2 0.2%
P (Lit.)		1 0.2%	1 0.1%
R		2 0.4%	3 0.3%
Q		1 0.2%	1 0.1%
U		5 0.9%	8 0.8%
Misc.	18 7.7%	18 3.2%	45 4.4%
Total	235 100.0%	559 100.0%	1,020 100.0%

Note. The row totals are of all articles in politics & government.

APPENDIX F
TABLES 60-66

TABLES 60-66:

MOST FREQUENTLY CITED AUTHORS

Table 60. Most Frequently Cited Authors, Anthropology & Sociology

Author	Freq.	%	Cumulative %	Area of Expertise
Korean Council for Women Drafted by Japan*	7	0.8	0.8	
Kendall, Laurel	6 (3)	0.7	1.5	anth. & soc.
Wagner, Edward W.	6	0.7	2.2	history
Deuchler, Martina	5	0.6	2.8	hist.; phil.
Yun, Chung-ok*	4.25	0.5	3.3	anth. & soc.
Cumings, Bruce	4	0.5	3.8	hist.; pol.
Dix, Griffin M.	4	0.5	4.2	anth. & soc.
Gordon, Andrew	4	0.5	4.7	economics
Lee, Chong-sik	4	0.5	5.2	politics
Park, Kyoung Sik	4	0.5	5.7	history
Palais, James B.	4	0.5	6.1	hist.; phil.
Yonbyon Chosonjok Chachiju Kaehwang Chipp'ilso	4	0.5	6.6	
Janelli, Dawnhee Yim	3.5	0.5	7.1	anth. & soc.

Note. Authors who received all of their citations from one source article are indicated with an asterisk (*). Numbers in parentheses represent author self-citation frequencies.

Table 61. Most Frequently Cited Author, Economics

Author	Freq.	%	Cumulative %	Area of Expertise
Kada, Naoji*	13	2.2	2.2	economics
Chosen Sotokufu	12	2.0	4.2	
Bank of Korea	7	1.2	5.4	
Cumings, Bruce	7	1.2	6.6	hist.; pol.
Economic Planning Board, Korea	6	1.0	7.6	
Hong, Won-tak	5	0.8	8.4	economics
In, Chong-sik	5	0.8	9.2	economics
Onoda Cement Company, Japan*	5	0.8	10.0	
Pak, Mun-gyu	5	0.8	10.8	economics
Palais, James B.	5	0.8	11.6	hist.; phil.

Note. Authors who received all of their citations from one source article are indicated with an asterisk (*).

Table 62. Most Frequently Cited Authors, History

Author	Freq.	%	Cumulative %	Area of Expertise
Ch'unch'ugwan	50	1.8	1.8	
Yi, Ki-baek	33.2	1.2	3.0	history
Yi, Kwang-nin	31 (5)	1.1	4.1	history
Han, U-gun	23	0.8	4.9	history
Hatada, Takashi	19	0.7	5.6	history
Sin, Yong-ha	19	0.7	6.3	history
Lew, Young I.	18 (13)	0.6	6.9	history
Ch'on, Kwan-u	17	0.6	7.5	history
Chosen Sotokufu	17	0.6	8.1	
Fukaya, Toshikane	16	0.6	8.6	history
Pyon, T'ae-sop	15	0.5	9.1	history
Sudo, Yoshiyuki	15	0.5	9.6	history
Kim, Sang-gi	14	0.5	10.2	history
Kuksa P'yonch'an Wiwonhoe	14	0.5	10.7	history
Yi, Son-gun	14	0.5	11.2	history

Note. Numbers in parentheses represent author self-citation frequencies.

Table 63. Most Frequently Cited Authors, Language

Author	Freq.	%	Cumulative %	Area of Expertise
Miller, Roy Andrew	27 (19)	4.8	4.8	language
Ramstedt, Gustaf J.	17	3.1	7.9	language
Martin, Samuel E.	15.8 (4)	2.9	10.8	language
Murayama, Shichiro	15.5	2.9	13.7	language
Yi, Ki-mun	15	2.7	16.4	language
Ono, Susumu	11	2.0	18.4	language
Kim, Chin-Wu	10 (4)	1.8	20.2	language
Poppe, Nicholas	9	1.6	21.8	language
Hong, Ki-mun	7	1.3	23.1	language
Street, John C.	7	1.3	24.4	language
Choson Ohak Yon'guso, DPRK*	6	1.1	25.5	language
Kim, Min-su	6	1.1	26.6	language
Ogura, Shinpei	6	1.1	27.2	language
Won, Ung-guk*	6	1.1	28.8	language

Note. Authors who received all of their citations from one source article are indicated with an asterisk (*). Numbers in parentheses represent author self-citation frequencies.

Table 64. Most Frequently Cited Authors, Literature

Author	Freq.	%	Cumulative %	Area of Expertise
Cho, Pyong-hwa*	13.5	3.5	3.5	writer
McCann, David R.	13.5 (12.5)	3.5	7.0	literature
Cho, Tong-il	11 (3)	2.8	9.8	literature
Chon, Kwang-yong	9	2.3	12.1	literature
Han, Sor-ya	6	1.5	13.6	writer
Iryon, 1206-1289	5	1.3	14.8	
Yi, In-jik	5	1.3	16.1	writer
Chong, Pyong-uk	4	1.0	17.1	literature
Ch'unch'ugwan	4	1.0	18.1	
Hwang, Sun-won*	4	1.0	19.1	writer

Note. Authors who received all of their citations from one source article are indicated with an asterisk (*). Numbers in parentheses represent author self-citation frequencies.

Table 65. Most Frequently Cited Authors, Philosophy & Religion

Author	Freq.	%	Cumula-	Area of
Ch'unch'ugwan	13	2.1	2.1	
Han, U-gun	13	2.1	4.1	history
Wagner, Edward W.	8	1.3	5.5	history
Chosen Sotokufu	7	1.1	6.6	
Jan, Yun-hua*	7	1.1	7.7	phil. & rel.
Han, Yong-u	6	.9	8.7	history
Palais, James B.	6 (4)	.9	9.6	hist.; phil.
Yi, Sang-baek	6	.9	10.6	history
Chu Hsi	5	.8	11.4	philosophy
De Bary, William Theodore	5	.8	12.2	phil. & rel.
Deuchler, Martina	5 (1)	.8	13.0	hist.; phil.
Yi, Song-mu	5	.8	13.8	history
Yongjo*	5	.8	14.6	

Note. Authors who received all of their citations from one source article are indicated with an asterisk (*). Numbers in parentheses represent author self-citation frequencies.

Table 66. Most Frequently Cited Authors, Politics & Government

Author	Freq.	%	Cumula-	Area of
Korean Central News Agency,				
Kihl, Young Whan	13.7 (8.8)	1.4	3.3	pol. & gov.
Kim, Il-song	13	1.3	4.6	
Suh, Dae-Sook	12.5 (3)	1.3	5.8	pol. & gov.
FBIS	11	1.1	6.9	
Koh, Byung Chul	10.5 (5)	1.1	8.0	pol. & gov.
U.S. Dept. of State	10	1.0	8.9	
Lee, Chong-sik	9.5	1.0	9.9	pol. & gov.
Dong, Wonmo	9 (5)	0.9	10.8	pol. & gov.
Cumings, Bruce	8 (3)	0.8	11.6	hist.; pol.
Han, Sungjoo	8	0.8	12.4	pol. & gov.
Kim, Chong-il	7	0.7	13.1	
Lee, Young Ho	7	0.7	13.7	pol. & gov.
Hahm, Pyong-choon	6.5	0.7	14.0	pol. & gov.
Brandt, Vincent S. R.	6 (1)	0.6	14.6	soc.; pol.
Yi, Man-gap	6	0.6	15.2	sociology

Note. Numbers in parentheses represent author self-citation frequencies.

APPENDIX G

TABLES 67-73

TABLES 67-73:

MOST FREQUENTLY CITED SOURCES

Table 67. Most Frequently Cited Sources, Anthropology & Sociology

Title	No. Citing	Freq.	%	Subject Class.	Format
Hungnyonggang Sinmun	1	19	2.3	AN	N
Hungnyonggang Ilbo	1	19	2.3	AN	N
Jilin Ribao	1	16	1.9	AN	N
Asahi shinbun	2	15	1.8	AN	N
Choson Ilbo	3	13	1.5	AN	N
Yonbyon Ilbo	1	10	1.2	AN	N
Tonga Ilbo	3	10	1.2	AN	N
Korea Journal	4	9	1.1	D	J
Chungang Ilbo	1	8	1.0	AN	N
Hangyore Sinmun	1	8	1.0	AN	N
Jen min jih pao	2	7	0.8	AN	N
Religion and Ritual in Korean Society	2	7	0.8	B	C
Yonyong Choson munbo	1	6	0.7	AN	N
Korea Newsreview	2	6	0.7	D	J
Hei-lung-chiang jih pao	1	5	0.6	AN	N
Occasional Papers on Korea	2	5	0.6	D	J
Journal of Korean Studies	3	5	0.6	D	J
Japan Chronicle	1	5	0.6	AP	J
Honolulu Star-Bulletin	2	5	0.6	AN	N
Journal of Asian Studies	2	4	0.5	D	J
New York Times	3	4	0.5	AN	N
Far Eastern Economic Review	3	4	0.5	HC	J
Asian Survey	4	4	0.5	D	J
Virtues in Conflict: Tradition and the Korean Woman Today	2	4	0.5	HQ	C

Note. In the 'format' column, 'N' denotes 'newspaper', 'J' denotes 'journal', and 'C' denotes 'collection of works' by an author or an 'edited volume' of works by several authors.

Table 68. Most Frequently Cited Sources, Economics

Title	No. Citing	Freq.	%	Subject Class.	Format
Keizai Geppo	1	14	2.3	HC	J
Economic Development and Cultural Change	5	9	1.5	HC	J
Singminji Sidae Sahoe Songkyok kwa Nongop Munje	1	8	1.5	HD	C
Sin Tonga	4	8	1.3	AP	J
Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895-1945	5	7	1.2	J	C
Political Economy of the New Asian Industrialism	4	5	0.8	HC	C
American Economic Review	2	5	0.8	HB	J
Origins of the Korean War, Vol. 1	4	4	0.7	D	M
Han'guk Kundae Kyongjesa Yon'gu	1	4	0.7	HC	C
World Politics	3	4	0.7	D	J

Note. In the 'format' column, 'J' denotes 'journal', 'C' denotes 'collection of works' by an author or an 'edited volume' of works by several authors, and 'M' denotes 'individual monograph' by an author or co-authors.

Table 69. Most Frequently Cited Sources, History

Title	No. Citing	Freq.	%	Subject Class.	Format
Yoksa Hakpo	21	77	2.7	D	J
New York Times	3	50	1.8	AN	N
Choson Wangjo Sillok	10	45	1.6	D	P, C
Chosen Gakuho	15	39	1.4	D	J
Tongnip Sinmun	3	38	1.3	AN	N
Sahak Yon'gu	8	28	1.0	D	J
Han'guksa Yon'gu	13	26	0.9	D	J
Independent	3	25	0.9	AN	N
Chindan Hakpo	10	22	0.8	D	J
Shigaku Zasshi	9	22	0.8	D	J
Korea Journal	16	21	0.7	D	J
Yoksa Kwahak	4	19	0.7	D	J
Rekishigaku Kenkyu	8	18	0.6	D	J
Journal of Korean Studies	12	18	0.6	D	J
Han'guksa, Chindan Hakhoe	13	17	0.6	D	C
Journal of Social Sciences					
Occasional Papers on Korea	7	14	0.5	D	J
Korean Repository	6	14	0.5	D	J
Tonga Ilbo	6	13	0.5	AN	N
Han'guksa, Kuksa P'yonch'an Wiwonhoe	7	13	0.5	D	C

Note. In the 'format' column, 'J' denotes 'journal', 'N' denotes 'newspaper', 'P' denotes 'primary source', and 'C' denotes 'collection of works' by an author or an 'edited volume' of works by several authors.

Table 70. Most Frequently Cited Sources, Language

Title	No. Citing	Freq.	%	Subject Class.	Format
Choson Omun	2	26	4.7	P	J
Language	9	21	3.8	P	J
Choson Ohak	1	12	2.2	P	J
Ural-Altaische Jahrbucher	5	11	2.0	D	J
Omun Yon'gu	2	8	1.5	P	J
Asea yon'gu	4	5	0.9	D	J
Studies in Korean Etymology	4	5	0.9	P	M
Journal of Japanese Studies	3	5	0.9	D	J
Shiratori Kurakichi zenshu	3	5	0.9	D	J
Pukhan	1	5	0.9	D	J
Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies	3	4	0.7	D	J
Han'gul	3	4	0.7	P	J
Kaejong kugosa kaesol	4	4	0.7	P	M
Language and Sex	1	4	0.7	P	C
Shukan Asahi	1	4	0.7	AP	J

Note. In the 'format' column, 'J' denotes 'journal', 'M' denotes 'individual monograph' by an author or co-authors, and 'C' denotes 'collection of works' by an author or an 'edited volume' of works by several authors.

Table 71. Most Frequently Cited Sources, Literature

Title	No. Citing	Freq.	%	Subject Class.	Format
Sasanggye	1	7	1.8	AP	J
Korean Culture	2	5	1.3	D	J
Korean Studies	2	4	1.0	D	J
Kyemyong Taehakkyo Nonmunjip	1	4	1.0	AS	J
Yi Kwang-Su Chonjip	3	4	1.0	P	P, C
Choson Munhak	2	4	1.0	P	J
Postwar Korean Short Stories	1	4	1.0	P	P, C
Han'guk Munhak T'ongsa	3	3	0.8	P	M
Korea Journal	2	3	0.8	D	J
Han'guk Hyondae Munhaksa Kaegwan	2	3	0.8	P	M
Korean Women: View from the Inner Room	3	3	0.8	HQ	C
Han'guk Chonhu Munje Chakp'umjip	1	3	0.8	P	P, C
Songs of Flying Dragons	3	3	0.8	P	P, M
Choson Wangjo Sillok	2	3	0.8	D	P, C

Note. In the 'format' column, 'J' denotes 'journal', 'P' denotes 'primary source', 'C' denotes 'collection of works' by an author or an 'edited volume' of works by several authors, and 'M' denotes 'individual monograph' by an author or co-authors.

Table 72. Most Frequently Cited Sources, Philosophy & Religion

Title	No. Citing	Freq.	%	Subject Class.	Format
Taisho shinshu daizokyo	3	28	4.4	B	P, C
Yoksa hakpo	3	13	2.1	D	J
Choson wangjo sillok	3	13	2.1	D	P, C
Tripitaka Koreanum	2	10	1.6	B	P, C
Journal of Korean Studies	2	7	1.1	D	J
Confucianism in Action	3	5	0.8	B	C
Korean Repository	1	5	0.8	D	J
Han'guk munhwasa taegye	2	5	0.8	D	C
Rise of Neo-Confucianism in Korea	2	5	0.8	B	C
Shigaku zasshi	1	4	0.6	D	J
Occasional Papers on Korea	2	4	0.6	D	J
Korea Journal	2	4	0.6	D	J
Journal of Asian studies	2	4	0.6	D	J
Literati Purges: Political Conflict in Early Yi Korea	4	4	0.6	D	M

Note. In the 'format' column, 'P' denotes 'primary source', 'C' denotes 'collection of works' by an author or an 'edited volume' of works by several authors, 'J' denotes 'journal', and 'M' denotes 'individual monograph' by an author or co-authors.

Table 73. Most Frequently Cited Sources, Politics & Government

Title	No. Citing	Freq.	%	Subject Class.	Format
Nodong Sinmun	5	35	3.4	AN	N
Korea Herald	4	34	3.3	AN	N
Tonga ilbo	4	27	2.6	AN	N
Korea Times	6	25	2.5	AN	N
Korea Journal	4	23	2.3	D	J
Japan Times	2	20	2.0	AN	N
Asian Survey	8	19	1.9	D	J
New York Times	3	18	1.8	AN	N
Asahi shinbun	5	15	1.5	AN	N
Far Eastern Economic Review	3	15	1.5	HC	J
FBIS	2	11	1.1	D	J
Department of State Bulletin	4	11	1.1	J	J
Time	2	10	1.0	AP	J
Pyongyang Times	4	8	0.8	AN	N
Korea Observer	6	7	0.7	D	J
Korea Newsreview	2	7	0.7	D	J
Sisa chonol	2	7	0.7	D	J
Koreana Quarterly	3	5	0.5	D	J
Korean Communist Movement, 1918-1948	6	6	0.6	HX	M
Choson Ilbo	3	5	0.5	AN	N
Journal of Northeast Asian Studies	5	5	0.5	HC	J
Communism in Korea	5	5	0.5	HX	M
Sin Tonga	3	5	0.5	AP	J
Han'guk ilbo	3	5	0.5	AN	N
Political Leadership in Korea	5	5	0.5	J	C
World politics	4	5	0.5	D	J
Yomiuri shinbun	1	5	0.5	AN	N

Note. In the 'format' column, 'N' denotes 'newspaper', 'J' denotes 'journal', 'M' denotes 'individual monograph' by an author or co-authors, and 'C' denotes 'collection of works' by an author or an 'edited volume' of works by several authors.

REFERENCES

- Arunachalam, S., & Markanday, S. (1981). Science in the middle-level countries: A bibliometric analysis of scientific journals of Australia, Canada, India and Israel. *Journal of Information Science*, 3, 13-26.
- Bolles, C. A. (1975). Characteristics of the literature of American studies as indicated by bibliographic citations. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1975). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 36, 4822.
- Borgman, C. L. (1990). Editor's introduction. In C. L. Borgman (Ed.), *Scholarly communication and bibliometrics* (pp. 10-27). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Broadus, R. N. (1971). The literature of the social sciences: A survey of citation studies. *International Social Science Journal*, 23, 236-43.
- Broadus, R. N. (1977). The applications of citation analyses to library collection building. *Advances in Librarianship*, 7, 299-335.
- Center for Korean Studies. (1997). *Guide to Korean studies 1997-1999*. Honolulu, HI: Author, University of Hawaii.
- Christovao, H. T. (1985, March). The aging of the literature of biomedical sciences in developed and developing countries. *Scientometrics*, 7, 411-430.
- Chung, Y. K. (1995, April). Characteristics of references in international classification systems literature. *Library Quarterly*, 65, 200-215.
- Cronin, B. (1981). Transatlantic citation patterns in educational psychology. *Social Science Information Studies*, 24, 48-51.
- Cullars, J. (1988, March). Characteristics of the monographic scholarship of foreign literary studies by the native speakers of English. *College & Research Libraries*, 49, 157-170.
- Diodato, V. (1994). *Dictionary of bibliometrics*. New York: Haworth Press.
- Friis, T. (1955, July). The use of citation analysis as a research technique and its implications for libraries. *South African Libraries*, 23, 12-15.
- Frohmann, B. (1982). A bibliometric analysis of the literature of cataloguing and classification. *Library Research*, 4, 355-373.

Futas, E. (1980). Communication and information patterns in the emerging interdisciplinary area of women's studies. (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1980). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 41, 1263.

Garfield, E., & Welljams-Dorof, A. (1990, September). Language use in international research: A citation analysis. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 511, 10-24.

Heinzkill, R. (1980, July). Characteristics of references in selected scholarly English literary journals. *Library Quarterly*, 50, 352-365.

Herman, I. L. (1991). Receptive to foreign literature: A comparison of UK and US citing behavior in librarianship and information science. *Library and Information Science Researches*, 13, 37-47.

Hulme, E. W. (1923). *Statistical bibliography in relation to the growth of modern civilization lectures, May 1922*. London: Butler and Tanner Grafton.

Kanasy, J. E. (1971). Citation characteristics and bibliographic control of the literature of microbiology. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1971). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 32, 1542.

Hertz, D. H. (1987). History of the development of ideas in bibliometrics. In *Encyclopedia of library and information science* (Vol. 42, pp. 144-219). New York: Dekker.

Kim, Han-Kyo. (1983). Building for the future on a sound social science base. In R. A. Morse (Ed.), *Korean studies in America: Options for the future: Papers from a conference held at the Wilson Center, November 1982* (pp. 123-126). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Korea Foundation. (1995). *The Korea Foundation: Annual report 1992-1993*. Seoul, Korea: Author.

Krishna, D. (1964). On the distinctions between the natural sciences, the social sciences and the humanities. *International Social Science Journal*, 16 (4), 513-23.

Lancaster, F. W., Lee, S. K., & Diluvio, C. (1990). Does place of publication influence citation behavior? *Scientometrics*, 19, 239-244.

Lange, L. (1985). Effects of disciplines and countries on citation habits. *Scientometrics*, 8, 205-15.

Lau, T. (1995). Chinese communication studies: A citation analysis of Chinese communication research in English-language journals. *Scientometrics*, 33 (1), 65-91.

Lawani, S. M. (1977a, January). Citation analysis and the quality of scientific productivity. *BioScience*, 27, 26-31.

Lawani, S. M. (1977b). The professional literature used by American and French agronomists and the implications for agronomic education. *Journal of Agronomic Education*, 6, 41-46.

Lievrouw, L. A. (1990). Reconciling structure and process in the study of scholarly communication. In C. L. Borgman (Ed.), *Scholarly communication and bibliometrics* (pp. 59-69). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lindholm-Romantschuk, Y., & Warner, J. (1996). The role of monographs in scholarly communication: an empirical study of philosophy, sociology and economics. *Journal of Documentation*, 52, 389-404.

Line, M. B. (1979). The influence of the types of sources used on the results of citation analyses. *Journal of Documentation*, 35, 265-84.

Line, M. B. (1981, January). The structure of social science literature as shown by a large-scale citation analysis. *Social Science Information Studies*, 1, 67-87.

Line, M. B., & Sandison, A. (1974). 'Obsolescence' and changes in the use of literature with time. *Journal of Documentation*, 30, 283-350.

Louttit, C. M. (1957). The use of foreign languages by psychologists, chemists, and physicists. *American Journal of Psychology*, 70, 314-316.

MacDonald, D. S. (1990). The study of Korea in the United States. *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society, Korea Branch*, 65, 41-47.

MacRoberts, M. H., & MacRoberts, B. R. (1989). Problems of citation analysis: a critical review. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 40 (5), 342-349.

Metoyer-Duran, C. (1993). The *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* and The *American Indian Quarterly*: A citation analysis. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 17 (4), 35-54.

Miyamoto, S., Midorikawa, N., & Nakayama, K. (1990). A view of studies on bibliometrics and related subjects in Japan. In C. L. Borgman (Ed.), *Scholarly communication and bibliometrics* (pp. 73-83). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Morse, R. A. (Ed.). (1983). *Korean studies in America: Options for the future: Papers from a conference held at the Wilson Center, November 1982*. Lanham, MD : University Press of America.

Murugesan, P. & Moravcsik, M. J.. (1978, May). Variation of the nature of citation measures with journals and scientific specialties. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 29, 141-47.

Nahm, A. C. (1983). A comprehensive strategy for Korean studies in North America. In R. A. Morse (Ed.), *Korean studies in America: Options for the future: Papers from a conference held at the Wilson Center, November 1982* (pp. 77-101). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Narin, F. (1976). *Evaluative bibliometrics: The use of publication and citation analysis in the evaluation of scientific activity*. Cherry Hill, N. J.: Computer Horizons, Inc.

O'Donnell, K. (1979). Forward. In D. R. McCann, J. Middleton, & E. J. Shultz. *Studies on Korea in transition* (pp. ix-x). Honolulu, HI: Center for Korean Studies, University of Hawaii.

Parker, E. B., Paisley, W. J., & Garrett, R. (1967). *Bibliographic citations as unobtrusive measures of scientific communication*. Stanford, CA: Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University.

Peters, S. H. (1990). Characteristics of the sources used by American historians writing on the history of modern Germany. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1990). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52, 330.

Price, D. J. de S. (1965). Networks of scientific papers. *Science*, 149, 510-15.

Price, D. J. de S. (1970). Citation measures of hard science, soft science, technology, and nonscience. In C. E. Nelson & D. K. Pollock (Eds.) *Communication among scientists and engineers* (pp. 3-22). Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company.

Pritchard, A. (1969, December). Statistical bibliography or bibliometrics? *Journal of Documentation* 25, 348-49.

Raisig, L. M. (1962, July). Statistical bibliography in the health sciences. *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 50, 450-61.

Reguant, S., & Casadella, J. (1994). English as lingua franca in geological scientific publications: a bibliometric analysis. *Scientometrics*, 29 (3), 335-351.

Saracevic, T., & Perk, L. J. (1973, March-April). Ascertaining activities in a subject area through bibliometric analysis: Application to *Library Literature*. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 24, 120-134.

Shulman, F. J. (1970). *Japan and Korea: An annotated bibliography of doctoral dissertations in western languages, 1877-1969*. Chicago: American Library Association; London: Frank Cass.

Shulman, F. J. (1982). *Doctoral dissertations on Japan and on Korea, 1969-1979: An annotated bibliography of studies in western languages*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.

Shulman, F. J. (1983). Doctoral dissertation research in comparative perspective. In R. A. Morse (Ed.), *Korean studies in America: Options for the future: Papers from a conference held at the Wilson Center, November 1982* (pp. 43-53). Lanham, MD : University Press of America.

Simonton, W. C. (1960). Characteristics of the research literature of the fine arts during the period 1948-1957. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1960). *Doctoral Dissertation International*, 20, 4667.

Smith, L. C. (1981, Summer). Citation analysis. *Library Trends*, 30, 83-106.

So, C. Y. K. (1995). Mapping the intellectual landscape of communication studies: an evaluation of its disciplinary status. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57, 17.

Soper, M. E. (1976, October). Characteristics and use of personal collections. *Library Quarterly* 46, 397-415.

Yitzhaki, M. (1988). The language barrier in the humanities: measures of language self-citation and self-derivation - the case of biblical studies. In L. Egghe & R. Rousseau (Eds.), *Informetrics 87/88* (pp. 301-314). Amsterdam: Elsevier.